

Arithmetic of Dedekind cuts of ordered Abelian groups

Antongiulio Fornasiero^{*†} Marcello Mamino^{‡§}

22nd May 2008

Abstract

We study Dedekind cuts on ordered Abelian groups. We introduce a monoid structure on them, and we characterise, via a suitable representation theorem, the universal part of the theory of such structures.

MSC: 06F05; 06F20

Key words: Dedekind cut; Dom; Ordered group

Contents

1	Dedekind cuts of ordered sets	3
2	Dedekind cuts of ordered groups	4
2.1	Group extensions	6
3	Doms	9
3.1	Basic definitions and facts	9
3.2	Sub-doms and dom-homomorphisms	15
3.3	Type of doms	17
3.4	Associated group and multiplicity	18
3.5	Signature	20
3.6	Proper and trivial doms	22
4	Constructions on doms	24
4.1	Morphisms and quotients	24
4.2	Compatible families of morphisms	26
4.3	Gluing	27
4.4	Insemination	28
4.5	Union	28
4.6	Products	28
4.7	Collapse	31
4.8	Dedekind cuts	31
4.9	Shift	33
5	Embedding doms in cuts of groups	33
5.1	Proper doms of the first and second type	34
5.2	Proper doms of the third type	35
5.3	Abelian extensions of groups	40
5.4	General case	41
5.5	Embedding a dom in a collapse	44

^{*}Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Matematica “L. Tonelli”, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 5, 56127 Pisa, Italy

[†]Corresponding author. E-mail: antongiulio.fornasiero@googlemail.com

[‡]Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, 56126 Pisa, Italy

[§]m.mamino@sns.it

6	Axiomatisation of doms	45
7	Valuations	47
8	Conclusion	50

Introduction

In this paper, we consider Dedekind cuts on linearly ordered Abelian groups. Given such a group G , call $\check{G}$ the set of cuts on G . This set is naturally endowed with an order and a minus. The interesting fact is that there are two non-equivalent ways of defining the sum of two cuts Λ and Γ , which we call the *left* sum (or simply the sum) $\Lambda + \Gamma$ and the *right* sum $\Lambda +^R \Gamma$, which are also definable in terms of each other and the minus. The resulting structure on the set $\check{G}$ is an ordered monoid, in which the cut $\mathbf{0} := ((-\infty, 0], (0, +\infty))$ is the neutral element. However, the cancellation law does not hold; specifically, $\Lambda + (-\Lambda) \neq \mathbf{0}$ in general.

After some preliminaries on ordered sets in §1, in §2 we determine some basic properties of the $\mathcal{L}$ -structure $\check{G}$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the signature $(\leq, \mathbf{0}, +, -)$. In §3 we take a more abstract approach and introduce the notion of **double ordered monoids (doms)**, which are $\mathcal{L}$ -structures satisfying some basic universal axioms, which are true both for every ordered Abelian group and for the set of Dedekind cuts of such groups. We then show that many properties follow from these axioms alone. In particular, the concept of **width** of an element turns out to be of fundamental importance: for every $\Lambda \in \check{G}$, the invariance group of Λ is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) := \{ \mu \in G : \mu + \Lambda = \Lambda \}$$

(where $+$ represents the natural action of G on $\check{G}$), and the width of Λ is equal to $\hat{\Lambda} := (\mathcal{G}(\Lambda))^+$ (where, for every $Z \subseteq G$, $Z^+ \in \check{G}$ denotes the upper edge of Z). Since $\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda +^R (-\Lambda)$, the width can be defined in the language $\mathcal{L}$, and it measures to what extent the cancellation law fails in M .

In §3.3 we show that doms can be classified into three types, according to a simple rule. For instance, for every ordered Abelian group G , the group itself is of the first type, while $\check{G}$ will be of either of the second or the third type, according to whether G is discrete, or densely ordered.

For every dom M , let $M^{\{0\}} := \{ x \in M : \hat{x} = \mathbf{0} \}$, the set of those elements with a trivial invariance group. $M^{\{0\}}$ modulo a suitable equivalence relation is an ordered Abelian group, which we denote with $G(M)$, and $G(\check{H})$ is the Cauchy completion of H .

Many variants of the basic constructions on groups (quotients, direct products, etc.) turn out to have useful equivalents in the context of doms: we examine some of them in §4.

In §5 we prove the main theorem (Thm. 2): the universal part of the theory cuts of ordered Abelian groups is given precisely by the axioms of doms plus the condition $-\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{0}$ (i.e. if a universal sentence for cuts is true, then it can be proven using the axioms for doms alone, plus $\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{0}$); moreover, every dom satisfying the additional condition $-\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{0}$ is a sub-dom of $\check{G}$ for some ordered Abelian group G . In conclusion, a dom is nothing else than a substructure of $\check{G}$ or $\check{\check{G}}$ (defined in 3.12) for some ordered Abelian group G , and the axioms of doms characterise the class of such substructures.

In §6 we study the independence of the axioms for doms we gave in §3, and we also give some alternative axiomatisations.

In §7 we examine the generalisations of classical concepts of valuation theory from ordered Abelian groups to doms. We also study phenomena that are peculiar to doms, namely *strong valuations*, which have only trivial counter-parts on groups.

We will now explain some of the motivation for studying Dedekind cuts on ordered Abelian groups. On one hand we think that such objects are quite natural, and deserve to be examined for their own sake. Moreover, the theory turns out to be more complex than one could think at first sight, but still manageable. On the other hand, the knowledge of the arithmetic rules of Dedekind cuts is necessary in the study of many “practical” contexts. For instance, let $\mathbb{K}$ be a valued field, with value group G : if one wants to build an additive complement to the valuation ring of $\mathbb{K}$, one needs to study the cuts on G . In this context, the first author needed to prove statements like Corollary 3.17 when he undertook the study of doms.

If $\mathbb{K}$ is an ordered field, the usefulness of the study of cuts on the additive and multiplicative groups of $\mathbb{K}$ has already been recognised, for instance they are the theme of [6, 13, 8, 7].

The article should be understandable to everybody with some basic knowledge of algebra, except for §5, where some acquaintance with model theory is required.

We wish to thank A. Berarducci, S. and F.-V. Kuhlmann, and M. Tressl for many useful discussions on the topic of the article.

Proviso. Unless we say otherwise, all orders will be linear, and all groups Abelian.

1 Dedekind cuts of ordered sets

Let O be a (linearly) ordered set. A subset S of O is **convex** if for every $\lambda, \lambda' \in S$ and $\gamma \in O$, if $\lambda \leq \gamma \leq \lambda'$, then $\gamma \in S$. It is **initial** (resp. **final**) if for every $\lambda \in S$ and $\gamma \in O$, if $\gamma \leq \lambda$ (resp. $\gamma \geq \lambda$), then $\gamma \in S$.

A **cut** (Λ^L, Λ^R) of O is a partition of O into two subsets Λ^L and Λ^R , such that, for every $\lambda \in \Lambda^L$ and $\lambda' \in \Lambda^R$, $\lambda < \lambda'$. We will denote with $\check{O}$ the set of cuts $\Lambda := (\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$ on the ordered set O (including $-\infty := (\emptyset, O)$ and $+\infty := (O, \emptyset)$).

In this section, unless specified otherwise, small Greek letters $\gamma, \lambda, \dots$ will denote elements of O , capital Greek letters $\Gamma, \Lambda, \dots$ will denote elements of $\check{O}$.

Given $\gamma \in O$,

$$\gamma^- := ((-\infty, \gamma), [\gamma, +\infty)) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^+ := ((-\infty, \gamma], (\gamma, +\infty))$$

are the cuts determined by γ . Note that Λ^R has a minimum $\lambda \in O$ iff $\Lambda = \lambda^-$. Dually, Λ^L has a maximum $\lambda \in O$ iff $\Lambda = \lambda^+$.

To define a cut we will often write $\Lambda^L := S$ (resp. $\Lambda^R := S'$), meaning that Λ is defined as $(S, O \setminus S)$ (resp. $\Lambda := (O \setminus S', S')$) when S is an initial subset of O (resp. S' is a final subset of O). For instance, the above definition of γ^- and γ^+ can be written $(\gamma^-)^L := (-\infty, \gamma)$ and $(\gamma^+)^L := (-\infty, \gamma]$.

The **ordering** on $\check{O}$ is given by $\Lambda \leq \Gamma$ if $\Lambda^L \subseteq \Gamma^L$ (or, equivalently, $\Lambda^R \supseteq \Gamma^R$).

To simplify the notation, we will write $\gamma < \Lambda$ as a synonym of $\gamma \in \Lambda^L$, or equivalently $\gamma^- < \Lambda$, or equivalently $\gamma^+ \leq \Lambda$. Similarly, $\gamma > \Lambda$ if $\gamma \in \Lambda^R$, or equivalently $\gamma^+ > \Lambda$. Hence, we have $\gamma^- < \gamma < \gamma^+$.

An ordered set O is **complete** if for every $S \subseteq O$, the least upper bound and the greatest lower bound of S exist.

1.1 Remark. If O is an ordered set, then $\check{O}$ is complete.

The ordering induces a topology on O , where a basis of open sets is the family of open intervals (a, b) , as $a < b$ vary in O . By [2, Theorem X.20], an order is complete iff it is compact; hence, $\check{O}$ is compact.

Given a subset $S \subseteq O$, the **upper edge** of S , denoted by S^+ , is the smallest cut Λ such that $S \subseteq \Lambda^L$. Similarly, S^- , the **lower edge** of S , is the greatest $\Lambda \in \check{O}$ such that $S \subseteq \Lambda^R$. Note that $S^+ = -\infty$ iff S is empty, and $S^+ = +\infty$ iff S is unbounded.

If $Z \subseteq O$ (resp. $Z \subseteq \check{O}$) we will denote by $\sup Z$ the least upper bound of Z in O (resp. in $\check{O}$), provided that it exists.

Note that that $S^+ = \sup\{\gamma^+ : \gamma \in S\}$, and $S^+ > \gamma > S^-$ for every $\gamma \in S$. Moreover, $\Lambda = (\Lambda^L)^+ = (\Lambda^R)^-$. Note that, for every $\gamma \in O$, $\gamma^+ = \{\gamma\}^+$, and $\gamma^- = \{\gamma\}^-$.

An ordered set O is **densely ordered** if for every $x < x' \in O$ there exists $y \in O$ such that $x < y < x'$. It is **discrete** if it is discrete as a topological space in its order topology.

Assume that O is a densely ordered set. Then we can define an equivalence relation $\equiv$ on $\check{O}$ by $\gamma^- \equiv \gamma^+$ for every $\gamma \in O$. The ordering on $\check{O}$ induces an ordering on the set of residues $\check{O}/\equiv$, which is complete and densely ordered. Since any complete and densely ordered set is connected, $\check{O}/\equiv$ is connected.

2 Dedekind cuts of ordered groups

Let G be a (linearly) ordered (Abelian) group. Note that a non-trivial group G is discrete iff there is a minimal positive element. Otherwise, it is densely ordered.

Given $S, S' \subseteq G$ and $\gamma \in G$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma + S &:= \{\gamma + \sigma : \sigma \in S\} \\ S + S' &:= \{\sigma + \sigma' : \sigma \in S, \sigma' \in S'\}.\end{aligned}$$

Given $\Lambda, \Gamma \in \check{G}$, their (left) **sum** is the cut

$$\Lambda + \Gamma := (\Lambda^L + \Gamma^L)^+;$$

i.e., $(\Lambda + \Gamma)^L = \{\lambda + \gamma : \lambda \in \Lambda^L, \gamma \in \Gamma^L\}$.

$(\check{G}, +)$ is an Abelian monoid: i.e., the addition is associative and commutative, and 0^+ is its neutral element. However, it does not obey the cancellation law: i.e. there exist Λ, Λ' and $\Gamma \in \check{G}$ such that $\Lambda + \Gamma = \Lambda' + \Gamma$, but $\Lambda \neq \Lambda'$; for instance, take $\Gamma = -\infty$, and Λ, Λ' any cuts.

$(\check{G}, \leq)$ is a complete linearly ordered set; moreover, $(\check{G}, +, \leq)$ is an ordered monoid, namely if $\alpha \leq \beta$, then $\alpha + \gamma \leq \beta + \gamma$.

We can also define right addition by

$$\Lambda +^R \Gamma := (\Lambda^R + \Gamma^R)^-;$$

i.e., $(\Lambda +^R \Gamma)^R = \{\lambda + \gamma : \lambda > \Lambda, \gamma > \Gamma\}$.

2.1 Remark. $\Lambda + \Gamma \leq \Lambda +^R \Gamma$.

$(\check{G}, +^R, \leq)$ is also an ordered Abelian monoid, with neutral element 0^- . The map ϕ^+ (resp. ϕ^-) from $(G, \leq, 0, +)$ to $(\check{G}, \leq, 0^+, +)$ (resp. to $(\check{G}, \leq, 0^-, +^R)$) sending γ to γ^+ (resp. to γ^-) is a homomorphism of ordered monoids.

Given $\gamma \in G$, we write

$$\gamma + \Lambda := (\gamma + \Lambda^L, \gamma + \Lambda^R) = (\{\gamma + \lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda^L\}, \{\gamma + \lambda' : \lambda' \in \Lambda^R\}).$$

One can verify that $\gamma + \Lambda = \gamma^+ + \Lambda = \gamma^- +^R \Lambda$.

Consider the anti-automorphism $-$ of $(G, \leq)$ sending γ to $-\gamma$. It induces an isomorphism (with the same name $-$) between $(\check{G}, \leq, +)$ and $(\check{G}, \geq, +^R)$, sending Λ to $(-\Lambda^R, -\Lambda^L)$. Hence, all theorems about $+$ have a dual statement about $+^R$.

2.2 Remark. $-(\gamma^+) = (-\gamma)^-$ and $-(\gamma^-) = (-\gamma)^+$ for all $\gamma \in G$.

2.3 Definition. Given $\Lambda, \Gamma \in \check{G}$, define their (right) difference $\Lambda - \Gamma$ in the following way:

$$\Lambda - \Gamma := (\Lambda^R - \Gamma^L)^+;$$

$$\text{i.e., } (\Lambda - \Gamma)^R = \{ \lambda - \gamma : \lambda > \Lambda, \gamma < \Gamma \}.$$

Note that $\Lambda - \Gamma$ is not equal to $\Lambda + (-\Gamma)$ in general.

Examples. 2.4. If $G = \mathbb{Q}$, we have 3 kinds of cuts in $\check{G}$ (besides $\pm\infty$): rational cuts of the form γ^+ (e.g. 0^+), rational cuts of the form γ^- (e.g. 0^-), and irrational cuts (e.g. $\sqrt{2}$).

2.5. If $G = \mathbb{R}$, we have only 2 kinds of cuts in $\check{G} \setminus \{ \pm\infty \}$: cuts of the form γ^+ and cuts of the form γ^- .

2.6. If $G = \mathbb{Z}$, all cuts in $\check{G} \setminus \{ \pm\infty \}$ are of the form $\gamma^+ = (\gamma + 1)^-$.

2.7. An important source of counterexamples is the ordered group $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ (the localisation of $\mathbb{Z}$ at the prime ideal (2)): it is the subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}$ of fractions with odd denominator.

2.8 Lemma. For all $\Lambda, \Gamma, \Theta \in \check{G}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda - \Gamma &= \Lambda +^R (-\Gamma), \\ (\Lambda - \Gamma)^L &= \bigcap_{\gamma < \Gamma} \Lambda^L - \gamma, \\ (\Lambda - \Gamma)^R &= \bigcup_{\gamma < \Gamma} \Lambda^R - \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda + \Gamma &= \{ \lambda + \gamma : \lambda < \Lambda, \gamma < \Gamma \}^+ = \sup \{ \lambda + \Gamma : \lambda < \Lambda \} = \sup \{ \Lambda + \gamma : \gamma < \Gamma \}; \\ \Lambda - \Gamma &= \{ \lambda - \gamma : \lambda > \Lambda, \gamma < \Gamma \}^- = \inf \{ \lambda - \Gamma : \lambda > \Lambda \} = \inf \{ \Lambda - \gamma : \gamma < \Gamma \} = \\ &= \{ \alpha : \alpha + \Gamma \leq \Lambda \}^-. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $\Lambda - (\Gamma + \Theta) = (\Lambda - \Gamma) - \Theta = (\Lambda - \Theta) - \Gamma$.

Note that $\Lambda + \Gamma \leq \inf \{ \Lambda + \Gamma' : \Gamma' > \Gamma \}$, but equality does not hold in general, even when G is densely ordered. For instance, take $G = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$, $\Lambda = -1/2$, $\Gamma = 1/2$.

One can also define the left difference $\Lambda \stackrel{L}{-} \Gamma$ as:

$$\Lambda \stackrel{L}{-} \Gamma := (\Lambda^L - \Gamma^R)^+;$$

i.e., $(\Lambda \stackrel{L}{-} \Gamma)^L = \{ \lambda - \gamma : \lambda < \Lambda, \gamma > \Gamma \}$. It is easy to see that $-(\Lambda + \Gamma) = (-\Lambda) - \Gamma$, and that $-\Lambda = 0^- - \Lambda = 0^+ \stackrel{L}{-} \Lambda$.

2.9 Remark. $\Lambda - \Gamma \geq \Lambda \stackrel{L}{-} \Gamma$.

2.10 Remark. If $\alpha + \beta = \gamma$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^+ + \beta^+ &= \gamma^+, & \alpha^+ +^R \beta^+ &\geq \gamma^+, \\ \alpha^+ + \beta^- &= \gamma^-, & \alpha^+ +^R \beta^- &= \gamma^+, \\ \alpha^- + \beta^- &\leq \gamma^-, & \alpha^- +^R \beta^- &= \gamma^-, \\ \Lambda + \gamma^+ &= \Lambda +^R \gamma^- = \Lambda + \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

It can happen that $\alpha^- + \beta^- < \gamma^-$, and similarly $\alpha^+ +^R \beta^+ > \gamma^+$. For instance, take $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and α, β any integers.

2.11 Lemma. $\Lambda < \Gamma$ iff $\Lambda - \Gamma < 0^+$.

Proof. $\Rightarrow$) If $\Lambda < \alpha < \Gamma$, then $0 = \alpha - \alpha > \Lambda - \Gamma$.

$\Leftarrow$) If $0 = \lambda - \gamma$ for some $\lambda > \Lambda$, $\gamma < \Gamma$, then $\Lambda < \lambda = \gamma < \Gamma$. $\square$

2.12 Definition. The ordered group G acts on $\check{G}$ via the map $\Lambda \mapsto \gamma + \Lambda$. Given $\Lambda \in \check{G}$, the **invariance group** of Λ is $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) := \{\gamma \in G : \gamma + \Lambda = \Lambda\}$, i.e. its stabiliser under the above action. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ is a convex subgroup of G . Define the **width** of Λ to be $\hat{\Lambda} := \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)^+ \in \check{G}$. The set of widths of $\check{G}$ is the set of cuts of the form $\hat{\Lambda}$, as Λ varies in $\check{G}$.

2.13 Remark. For every $\Lambda \in \check{G}$, $\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda - \Lambda > 0$. Moreover, $\hat{\hat{\Lambda}} = \hat{\Lambda}$. Besides, if H is a submonoid of G and $\Lambda := H^+$, then $\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda$. If moreover H is a subgroup of G , then $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ is the convex hull of H ; therefore, if H is a convex subgroup of G , then $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) = H$. Hence, there is a canonical bijection between convex subgroups of G and widths of $\check{G}$, sending H to H^+ (whose inverse maps Λ to $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$).

The above remark helps explain our choice of definition $\Lambda - \Gamma = \Lambda +^R (-\Gamma)$.

Examples. Let $1 \in G$ be a positive element, and $\Omega := \{n \cdot 1 : n \in \mathbb{N}\}^+$.

2.14. $\Omega + \Omega = \Omega - \Omega = \Omega$.¹ Moreover, $\Omega \perp^L \Omega = -\Omega$.

2.15. If 1 is the immediate successor of 0, then

$$\begin{aligned}0^+ &= 1^- = ((-\infty, 0], [1, +\infty)), \\ 0^- &= (-1)^+ = ((-\infty, -1], [0, +\infty)).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\underbrace{0^+ + \dots + 0^+}_{n \text{ times}} = 0^+$, while $\underbrace{0^+ +^R \dots +^R 0^+}_{n \text{ times}} = n^-$.

2.1 Group extensions

Let G' be an ordered group, and G be a subgroup of G' . In this subsection we investigate the relationship between elements of G' and cuts of G . The content of this subsection will not be used in the rest of the article; however, we hope that the former will help to clarify the latter.

In the rest of this subsection, the capital Greek letters will denote cuts of G ; the small Greek letters, elements of G ; and the small Latin letters, elements of G' .

¹It can happen that $\Omega +^R \Omega > \Omega$.

2.16 Definition. For every $\Lambda \in \check{G}$ and $x \in G'$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda \leq x & \text{ if } \forall \lambda \in G \ \lambda < \Lambda \rightarrow \lambda < x, \\ \Lambda > x & \text{ if } \Lambda \not\leq x;\end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $\Lambda \geq x$ and $\Lambda < x$. We also say that x satisfies Λ (or that x fills Λ), and write $x \models \Lambda$,² iff

$$\Lambda \leq x \text{ and } \Lambda \geq x.$$

2.17 Remark. The following are equivalent:

1. $\Lambda < x$;
2. $\exists \lambda \in G \ \Lambda < \lambda \leq x$;
3. $\Lambda \leq x$ and $x \not\models \Lambda$.

Moreover, if $x \in G$, then $\Lambda < x$ in G' iff $\Lambda < x$ in G .

Note that if $x \models \Lambda$, then $x \in G' \setminus G$.

2.18 Lemma. 1. If $\Lambda \leq x \leq \Gamma$, then $\Lambda \leq \Gamma$.

2. If $x < \Lambda \leq y$, then $x < y$.³

3. If $x \leq \Lambda \leq \Gamma$, then $x \leq \Gamma$.

4. If $x \leq y \leq \Lambda$, then $x \leq \Lambda$.

5. $x \geq \Lambda$ iff $-x \leq -\Lambda$.

6. If $x \leq \lambda < \Lambda$, then $x < \Lambda$.⁴

Proof. Easy. □

2.19 Lemma. Let $\Lambda \leq x$ and $\Gamma \leq y$. Then, $\Lambda + \Gamma \leq x + y$. If moreover $x \models \Lambda$ and $y \models \Gamma$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda + \Gamma & \leq x + y \leq \Lambda +^R \Gamma; \\ \Lambda \perp \Gamma & \leq x - y \leq \Lambda - \Gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If moreover $\Lambda = \Gamma$ (and $x, y \models \Lambda$), then $|x - y| \leq \hat{\Lambda}$.

If instead $\Lambda < x$ and $\Gamma < y$, then $\Lambda + \Gamma \leq \Lambda +^R \Gamma < x + y$.⁵

Proof. The first and last inequalities can be done by direct computation. The others are direct consequences of the first one. □

2.20 Lemma. If $\Gamma \leq x$, then $\lambda + \Gamma \leq \lambda + x$. If $\Gamma < x$, then $\lambda + \Gamma < \lambda + x$.

Proof. Trivial. □

²We use the symbols $\models$ from model theory, because we can regard a cut as a set of formulae; moreover, $x \models \Lambda$ iff x satisfies the corresponding formulae $\lambda' < x < \lambda''$, as λ' and λ'' vary in G , with $\lambda' < \Lambda < \lambda''$.

³ $x \leq \Lambda \leq y$ does not imply that $x \leq y$.

⁴ $x < y \leq \Lambda$ does not imply that $x < \Lambda$.

⁵It might happen that $\Lambda < x$, $\Gamma \leq y$, but $x + y \not\models \Lambda + \Gamma$.

2.21 Lemma. Assume that there exists $x_0 \in G'$ such that $x_0 \models \Lambda$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} S_L &:= \{ \alpha \in G : \exists x \in G' \ x \models \Lambda \ \& \ x \geq \alpha \}; \\ S_R &:= \{ \alpha \in G : \exists x \in G' \ x \models \Lambda \ \& \ x \leq \alpha \}; \\ T &:= \{ \alpha \in G : \forall x, y \in G' \ x, y \models \Lambda \rightarrow y - x \leq \alpha \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\Lambda = S_L^+ = S_R^-$, and $\widehat{\Lambda} = T^-$. Moreover,

$$S_L = \{ \alpha \in G : \alpha < x_0 \}, \quad S_R = \{ \alpha \in G : \alpha > x_0 \}.$$

Proof. First, we shall prove that $\alpha < x_0$ iff, for all $x \models \Lambda$, $\alpha < x$. The “if” direction is obvious. For the other direction, let $x \models \Lambda$, and suppose, for contradiction, that $x \leq \alpha < x_0$. Since $x \geq \Lambda$, we have that $x > \beta$ for all $\beta < \Lambda$, and therefore $\alpha > \Lambda$. Similarly, since $x_0 \leq \Lambda$, we have that $\alpha < \Lambda$, a contradiction.

Claim 1. $\lambda < S_L^+$ iff $\lambda < x_0$.

Let $\lambda < S_L^+$. Then, there exists $\alpha \in S_L^L$ such that $\lambda \leq \alpha$. Hence, $\lambda \leq x$ for every $x \models \Lambda$, and in particular $\lambda \leq x_0$. Since we cannot have $\lambda \models \Lambda$, we conclude that $\lambda < x_0$. Conversely, if $\lambda < x_0$, then, by definition, $\lambda \in S_L^L$, and therefore $\lambda < S_L^+$.

Let us prove now that $\Lambda = S_L^+$. If $\lambda < \Lambda$, then $\lambda < x_0$; since $x_0 \models \Lambda$, we have that $\lambda < S_L^+$, and therefore $\Lambda \leq S_L^+$.

If $\lambda < S_L^+$, then $\lambda < x_0$. Since $x_0 \models \Lambda$, we have that $\lambda < \Lambda$, and therefore $S_L^+ \leq \Lambda$.

$\Lambda = S_R^-$ is dual to $\Lambda = S_L^+$.

It remains to prove that $\widehat{\Lambda} = T^-$. The following claim is obvious.

Claim 2. $\alpha < T^-$ iff there exist $x, y \models \Lambda$ such that $y - x \geq \alpha$.

Let $\alpha < \widehat{\Lambda}$. Since $\widehat{\Lambda}$ is the upper bound of a group (specifically, the group $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$), we also have that $2\alpha < \widehat{\Lambda}$. We want to prove that $\alpha < T^-$, which would imply that $\widehat{\Lambda} \leq T^-$. By Claim 2, the thesis is equivalent to $\alpha \leq y - x$, for some $x, y \models \Lambda$. Assume not. Hence, $\alpha > 0$, and $x_0 - \alpha$ and $x_0 + \alpha$ do not satisfy Λ . Therefore, there exist λ' and $\lambda'' \in G$, such that

$$x_0 - \alpha \leq \lambda' < \Lambda < \lambda'' \leq x_0 + \alpha.$$

Thus, $\lambda'' - \lambda' \leq 2\alpha$, implying that $2\alpha > \widehat{\Lambda}$, a contradiction.

Conversely, let $\alpha > \widehat{\Lambda}$. Then, $\alpha > 0$. Moreover, there exist $\lambda', \lambda'' \in G$, such that $\lambda' < \Lambda < \lambda''$, and $\alpha \geq \lambda'' - \lambda'$. Let $x, y \in \Lambda$, with $x \leq y$. Since $\lambda' < x \leq y < \lambda''$, we have that $\lambda'' - \lambda' > y - x$. Hence, $\alpha > y - x$ for every $x, y \models \Lambda$. Thus, by Claim 2, $\alpha > T^-$. Therefore, $\widehat{\Lambda} \geq T^-$. $\square$

Assume that there exist $x_0, y_0 \in G'$ such that $x_0 \models \Lambda$ and $\Gamma \models y_0$. We could try to define the sum of Λ and Γ using x_0 and y_0 . More precisely, we could define $z_0 := x_0 + y_0$, consider the cut Θ induced by z_0 on G , and define $\Lambda \dot{+} \Gamma := \Theta$. However, Θ depends on our choice of x_0 and y_0 : different choices would produce different cuts, in general. The canonical choice would be: define

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= \{ x + y : x \models \Lambda \ \& \ y \models \Gamma \} \subseteq G', \\ V_L &:= \{ \alpha \in G : \forall z \in V \ \alpha < z \}, \\ V_R &:= \{ \alpha \in G : \forall z \in V \ \alpha > z \}; \end{aligned}$$

set $\Lambda \dot{+}^L \Gamma := V_L^+$, $\Lambda \dot{+}^R \Gamma := V_R^-$. The next proposition implies that $\dot{+}^L = +$ and $\dot{+}^R = +^R$.

2.22 Proposition. Assume that there exist $x_0, y_0 \in G'$ such that $x_0 \models \Lambda$ and $y_0 \models \Gamma$. Define V, V_L and V_R as above. Then, $\Lambda + \Gamma = V_L^+$, and $\Lambda \dot{+}^R \Gamma = V_R^-$.

Note that if $z \in V$, then $\Lambda + \Gamma \leq z \leq \Lambda \dot{+}^R \Gamma$. However, the opposite implication might be false. For instance, take $G = \mathbb{Z}$, $G' = \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{2}$, $\Lambda = \Gamma = 0^+$, and $z = 1/2$.

Proof. Let $\alpha < \Lambda + \Gamma$. Hence, there exist $\lambda < \Lambda$ and $\gamma < \Gamma$ such that $\alpha \leq \lambda + \gamma$. If $x \models \Lambda$ and $y \models \Gamma$, then $\lambda < x$ and $\gamma < y$. Therefore, $\alpha \leq \gamma + \lambda < x + y$. Thus, $\alpha < V_L^+$.

Conversely, let $\alpha > \Lambda + \Gamma$. Define $z_0 := x_0 + y_0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $\alpha < z$ for every $z \in V$, and let $v := z_0 - \alpha \geq 0$. Let $x := x_0 - v$ and $y := y_0 - v$. If $x \models \Lambda$, then $\alpha = x + y_0 \in V$, a contradiction. Similarly, we reach a contradiction if $y \models \Gamma$. Hence, there exist λ and γ such that $x \leq \lambda < \Lambda$ and $y \leq \gamma < \Gamma$. Define $\theta := \alpha - (\lambda + \gamma)$.

Claim 1. $\lambda + \theta > \Lambda$ and $\gamma + \theta > \Gamma$.

If, for instance, $\lambda + \theta < \Lambda$, then $\alpha + \gamma = \lambda + \gamma + \theta < \Lambda + \Gamma$, absurd.

Therefore, $\lambda + \gamma + 2\theta > \Lambda \dot{+}^R \Gamma$. Thus,

$$v = z_0 - \alpha < \lambda + \gamma + 2\theta - \alpha = \alpha + \theta - \alpha = \theta,$$

and we have $v < \theta$. On the other hand, $x_0 + y_0 - 2v = x + y \leq \lambda + \gamma = \alpha - \theta$, thus $\alpha + 2v \geq z_0 + \theta = \alpha + v + \theta$, and therefore $v \geq \theta$, absurd. $\square$

Examples. 2.23. Let $G := \mathbb{Q}$ and $G' := \mathbb{R}$. Every $r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ determines a cut Θ on $\mathbb{Q}$, and Θ is the unique cut such that $r \models \Theta$.

2.24. Let $G := \mathbb{Z}$ and $G' := \mathbb{R}$. Let $\Lambda = \Gamma = 0^+$. Note that $x \geq \Lambda$ iff $x > 0$, and that $x \models \Lambda$ iff $0 < x < 1$. Moreover, V is the interval $(0, 2) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Since $\Lambda + \Gamma = 0^+$ and $\Lambda \dot{+}^R \Gamma = 2^-$, the proposition is verified.

3 Doms: Double ordered monoids

3.1 Basic definitions and facts

3.1 Definition. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the language $(\leq, \mathbf{0}, +, -)$, where $\leq, \mathbf{0}, +$, and $-$ are symbols for a binary relation, a constant, a binary function, and a unary function respectively. A **pre-dom** is an $\mathcal{L}$ -structure $(M, \leq, \mathbf{0}, +, -)$, where $(M, \leq, \mathbf{0}, +)$ is an Abelian ordered monoid with neutral element $\mathbf{0}$,⁶ and $- : M \rightarrow M$ is an anti-automorphism of $(M, \leq)$ such that $-(-x) = x$. For $x, y \in M$ define:

$$\begin{aligned} x \dot{+}^R y &:= -((-x) + (-y)), \\ x - y &:= x \dot{+}^R (-y) = -((-x) + y), \\ \delta &:= -\mathbf{0}, \\ \widehat{x} &:= x - x, \\ |x| &:= \max(x, -x), \\ x \dot{+}^L y &:= x + (-y). \end{aligned}$$

$\widehat{x} = x - x$ is called the **width** of x .

⁶I.e., $+$ is associative and commutative, with neutral element $\mathbf{0}$, and $\leq$ is a linear order satisfying $z \leq z' \rightarrow z + t \leq z' + t$ for every $z, z', t \in M$.

3.2 Remark. Let M be a pre-dom and $x, y, z \in M$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 x +^R \delta &= x - \mathbf{0} = x; \\
 \delta - x &= -x; \\
 -\widehat{x} &= x \perp^L x; \\
 \widehat{-x} &= \widehat{x}; \\
 -(x - y) &= y \perp^L x; \\
 x +^R (y +^R z) &= (x +^R y) +^R z; \\
 x - (y + z) &= (x - y) - z \\
 &= x +^R (-y) +^R (-z); \\
 \text{if } x \leq \delta &\text{ then } y +^R x \leq y; \\
 \text{if } x \geq \mathbf{0} &\text{ then } y - x \leq y; \\
 \text{if } x + y < x + z &\text{ or } x +^R y < x +^R z, \text{ then } y < z; \\
 \text{if } y \leq x \leq z, &\text{ then } z - y \geq \widehat{x}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $x +^R (y - z) = (x +^R y) - z$, in the following we often will write $x +^R y - z$ for any of the above equivalent expressions. Similarly, we will drop the parentheses in $x + (y + z)$ and $x +^R (y +^R z)$.

3.3 Remark. If M is a pre-dom, then $M^{\text{dual}} := (M, \geq, \delta, +^R, -)$ is also a pre-dom, the **dual** of M . Hence, any theorem about pre-doms has a dual theorem (the corresponding theorem for M^{dual}).

3.4 Definition. A **dom** M is a pre-dom satisfying the following axioms: for every $x, y \in M$:

MA. $\delta \leq \mathbf{0}$;

MB. $|x| \geq \mathbf{0}$;

MC. $x \geq y$ iff $x - y \geq \mathbf{0}$.

Note that the above axiomatisation is universal.

3.5 Remark. For a pre-dom, Axiom **MB** is equivalent to the fact that the interval $(\delta, \mathbf{0})$ is empty (if $\delta > \mathbf{0}$, the interval $(\delta, \mathbf{0})$ is empty by default).

3.6 Remark. For a pre-dom, Axiom **MC** is equivalent to (the universal closure of) any of the following:

1. $x < y$ iff $x - y < \mathbf{0}$;
2. $x \perp^L y > \delta$ iff $x > y$;
3. $x - y < z$ iff $x < y + z$;
4. $x - y \geq z$ iff $x \geq y + z$.

Proof. Applying (1) twice, we get $x - y < z$ iff $(x - y) - z = x - (y + z) < \mathbf{0}$ iff $x < y + z$. Therefore, (1) implies (3). The rest is easy. $\square$

Hence, in the following we will refer to any of the aforesaid equivalent forms as Axiom **MB**, **MC** respectively.

Proviso. For the rest of the article, M will be a dom and G a (linearly) ordered (Abelian) group, unless we say otherwise.

3.7 Remark. The axioms **MA**, **MB** and **MC** are self-dual. Therefore, if M is a dom, then its dual is also a dom. Hence, any theorem about doms has a dual theorem.

Proof. For instance, the dual of Axiom **MC** is $x \leq y$ iff $x \stackrel{L}{\leq} y \leq \delta$, i.e. $x \leq y$ iff $y - x \geq 0$, which is axiom **MC** itself. $\square$

Examples. 3.8. Any ordered group is a dom, with $\delta = \mathbf{0}$ and $x + y = x \stackrel{R}{+} y$.

3.9. We have seen that $\check{G}$ is a dom (cf. Lemma 2.11).

3.10. The trivial models. Let N be an ordered set with minimum $\mathbf{0}$. Define M as the disjoint union of two copies of N , i.e. $M := -N \sqcup N$, with the reversed order on $-N$, and the rule $-N < N$, and the minus defined in the obvious way. Define

$$x + y := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| > |y|, \\ y & \text{if } |x| < |y|, \\ \min(x, y) & \text{if } |x| = |y|. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that M is a dom. Moreover, $\delta < \mathbf{0}$, and for every $x, y \in M$,

$$x \stackrel{R}{+} y = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| > |y|, \\ y & \text{if } |x| < |y|, \\ \max(x, y) & \text{if } |x| = |y|, \end{cases}$$

and $\hat{x} = |x|$.

3.11. The above example can be modified by identifying $\mathbf{0}$ with δ . The resulting structure (with the same definition of operations and relations) is also a dom, satisfying $\delta = \mathbf{0}$ and $\hat{x} = |x|$.

3.12. Define $\tilde{G}$ to be the disjoint union of G and $\check{G}$, with order and operations extending the ones on G and $\check{G}$ in the way defined in §2. Note that $\mathbf{0}$, the neutral element of $\tilde{G}$, is the neutral element of G . Moreover, $\tilde{G}$ is a dom with $\delta = \mathbf{0}$.

3.13. Let $(G, \leq, 0, +)$ be an ordered group, and use $\stackrel{*}{+}$ to denote its minus operation. Fix $\delta \in G$. Define $M := G$, with the same order, neutral element and plus. However, define $-x := (\stackrel{*}{+}x) + \delta$. Then, $x \stackrel{R}{+} y = -(-x + -y) = \stackrel{*}{+}(\stackrel{*}{+}x + \stackrel{*}{+}y + 2\delta) + \delta = x + y \stackrel{*}{+} \delta$. Moreover, $x - y = x \stackrel{*}{+} y$, and $\hat{x} = 0$, and $-0 = \delta$. Therefore, M is a pre-dom. Moreover, if $\delta > 0$, M satisfies axioms **MB** and **MC**, while if $\delta < 0$, M satisfies axioms **MA** and **MC**. If $\delta = 0$, we retrieve Example 3.8. Note that we have $0 \stackrel{R}{+} 0 = \stackrel{*}{+}\delta$. Hence, if $\delta > 0$, we have $0 \stackrel{R}{+} 0 < 0$.

Moreover, if $\delta < 0$, then M is a dom iff the interval $(\delta, 0)$ is empty, i.e. iff $\delta = -1$, where 1 is the minimal positive element of G . For instance, if $G = \mathbb{Z}$ (and $\delta = -1$), then $M = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{\pm\infty\}$. In the general case, M is the subset of $\tilde{G}$ of elements with invariance group $\{0\}$ (again, if $\delta = -1$).

3.14 Definition. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, y \in M$, define

$$x - ny := (\underbrace{\dots (x - y) - y}_{n \text{ times}}) - y, \quad x + ny := x + \underbrace{y + \dots + y}_{n \text{ times}}.$$

In particular, $x - 0y = x + 0y = x$. Moreover, given $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define

$$nx := \underbrace{x + \cdots + x}_{n \text{ times}}, \quad (-n)x := -(nx) = \underbrace{-x - \cdots - x}_{n \text{ times}}.$$

It is easy to see that $(x - ny) - my = x - (n + m)y$, and $(x + ny) + my = x + (n + m)y$. In general, $n(-x) \neq -(nx) = (-n)x$. Take for instance $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$, $x = 1/2$, $n = 2$. However, if G is divisible or $n = 1$, then $n(-\Gamma) = -(n\Gamma)$ for every $\Gamma \in \check{G}$.

3.15 Proposition. *Let $w, x, y, z \in M$. Then,*

1. $\widehat{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$;
2. $\mathbf{0} +^R \mathbf{0} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\delta + \delta \leq \delta$;
3. $x + y \leq x +^R y$;
4. $(x + y) - y \geq x \geq (x - y) + y$;
5. $x - y = \max\{z \in M : y + z \leq x\}$;⁷
6. $((x + y) - y) + y = x + y$ and $((x - y) + y) - y = x - y$;
7. $x + \widehat{x} = x = x - \widehat{x}$;
8. $y > \widehat{x}$ iff $x + y > x$;
9. $\widehat{x} \leq |x|$;
10. $x - y \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $y - x \geq \mathbf{0}$ iff $x = y$;
11. $(x + y) +^R z \geq x + (y +^R z)$;
12. $(x + y) +^R z +^R w \geq (x +^R z) + (y +^R w)$, and $(x + y) - (z + w) \geq (x - z) + (y - w)$;
13. $(x +^R y) + z + w \leq (x + z) +^R (y + w)$;
14. if $x + y < x +^R z$, then $y \leq z$;
15. if $x + y < x +^R y$, then $\widehat{x} = \widehat{y}$;
16. if $x, y < \mathbf{0}$, then $x +^R y < \mathbf{0}$;
17. if $x < z$ and $y < w$, then $x +^R y < z + w$, and a fortiori $x + y < z + w$;⁸ in particular, if $t < z < x$, then $x \perp^L t > \widehat{z}$ (by taking $y := -z$ and $w := -t$);
18. $\widehat{x} + \widehat{x} = \widehat{x}$;
19. if $2x = x$, then $\widehat{x} = |x|$;⁹
20. $\widehat{\widehat{x}} = \widehat{x}$;
21. $\widehat{x + y} = \widehat{x +^R y} = \max(\widehat{x}, \widehat{y})$;

⁷G. Birkhoff [2, XIV§5] calls such an element the residual of x by y .

⁸From $y < w$, we can only conclude that $x +^R y \leq x + w$ (it is the contrapositive of 14), but not even that $x + y < x +^R w$. For instance, take $G = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$, $x = 1/2$, $y = 0^-$, $w = 0^+$; then, $x + y = x +^R w = 1/2$.

⁹The converse is not true. Take for instance $M = \check{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $x = 0^-$.

- 22. $x \dot{+}^R y \leq (x+y) \dot{+}^R \hat{x}$ (and the same for $\hat{y}$);
- 23. if $\hat{x} > \hat{y}$, then $x \dot{+}^R \hat{y} = x$;
- 24. if $y > x$, then $y \geq x \dot{+}^R \hat{y}$;
- 25. the intervals $(x, x \dot{+}^R \mathbf{0})$ and $(x + \delta, x)$ are empty;
- 26. if $x, y \leq \hat{z}$, then $x + y \leq \hat{z}$;
- 27. if $x, y < \hat{z}$, then $x \dot{+}^R y < \hat{z}$.

Proof. 1. If, by contradiction, $x - x < \mathbf{0}$, then, by Axiom **MC**, $x < x$, absurd.

2. If, by contradiction, $\mathbf{0} \dot{+}^R \mathbf{0} < \mathbf{0}$, then, by Axiom **MC**, $\mathbf{0} < \delta$, contradicting Axiom **MA**. The other inequality is the dual one.

3. If, by contradiction, $x + y > x \dot{+}^R y$, then $x \dot{+}^R y - (x + y) < \mathbf{0}$, and it follows $\hat{x} \dot{+}^R \hat{y} < \mathbf{0}$. The conclusion follows from 1 and 2.

4. If, by contradiction, $(x + y) - y < x$, then, by Axiom **MC**, $x + y < x + y$, absurd. Similarly for the other inequality.

5. By Axiom **MC**, $y + z \leq x$ iff $y \leq x - z$.

6. By 4, the pair of maps $x \mapsto x \dot{+} y$ forms a Galois connection between the ordered set M and its dual. The conclusion is true for any such correspondence [10, Theorem IV.5.1]. More in detail, applying 4 twice, we get

$$\underbrace{((x+y) - y)}_{\text{simplify}} + y \geq x + y \geq \underbrace{((x+y) - y)}_{\text{simplify}} + y.$$

The other equality is the dual one.

7. By 1, $x + \hat{x} \geq x$. If, by contradiction, $x < x + \hat{x}$, then, by Axiom **MC**, $\hat{x} < \hat{x}$, absurd. The other equality is the dual one.

8. By Axiom **MC**, $x - x < y$ iff $x < x + y$.

9. Since $\widehat{-x} = \hat{x}$, w.l.o.g. we can assume that $x = |x|$, hence, by Axiom **MB**, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, $\hat{x} = x - x$ which is $\leq x = |x|$ by Remark 3.2.

10. Immediate from Axiom **MC**.

11. If, by contradiction, $(x + y) \dot{+}^R z < x + (y \dot{+}^R z)$, then $(x + y) \dot{+}^R z - x < y \dot{+}^R z$; however 4 implies $((x + y) - x) \dot{+}^R z \geq y \dot{+}^R z$, which is absurd.

12. If, by contradiction, $(x + y) \dot{+}^R z \dot{+}^R w < (x \dot{+}^R z) + (y \dot{+}^R w)$, then $(x + y) \dot{+}^R w - (y \dot{+}^R w) \dot{+}^R z < x \dot{+}^R z$, hence, by Remark 3.2, $(x + y) \dot{+}^R w - (y \dot{+}^R w) < x$, thus by Axiom **MC** $(x + y) \dot{+}^R w < x + (y \dot{+}^R w)$, contradicting 11.

13. Dual of 12.

14. Assume, for contradiction, that $y > z$, i.e. $z - y < \mathbf{0}$. The hypothesis is equivalent to $(x + y) - (x \dot{+}^R z) < \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $(-x - y) + (x \dot{+}^R z) > \delta$. Since by 13 $(-x - y) + (x \dot{+}^R z) \leq z - y - \hat{x}$, we have by Axiom **MB** $z - y - \hat{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, by 1, $z - y \geq \mathbf{0}$, absurd.

15. Assume, by contradiction, that $\widehat{x} < \widehat{y}$. Then, $\widehat{x} - \widehat{y} < \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, $x + y < x \dot{+}^R y$ implies that $(x \dot{+}^R y) \perp (x + y) > \delta$, thus $(x \dot{+}^R y) + (-x - y) \geq \mathbf{0}$ (we used Axiom MB). Therefore, by 12, $(x - x) \dot{+}^R (y \perp y) \geq \mathbf{0}$, hence $\widehat{x} - \widehat{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$, a contradiction.

16. Since $y < \mathbf{0}$, $y \leq \delta$, thus $x \dot{+}^R y \leq x < \mathbf{0}$.

17. The hypothesis is equivalent to $x - z < \mathbf{0}$ and $y - w < \mathbf{0}$, which, by 16, implies $(x - z) \dot{+}^R y - w < \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $(x \dot{+}^R y) - (z + w) < \mathbf{0}$, which is equivalent to the conclusion.

18. Since $\widehat{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $\widehat{x} + \widehat{x} \geq \widehat{x}$. If, by contradiction, $\widehat{x} + \widehat{x} > \widehat{x}$, then $x + \widehat{x} + \widehat{x} > x$, contradicting 7.

19. Suppose, for contradiction, that $2x = x$, but $\widehat{x} < |x|$ (by 9). W.l.o.g. we may assume $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, because if not then $x' := -x$ satisfies the same hypothesis as x (in particular $2x' = x'$ is a consequence of $x' \dot{+}^R x' = x$ since $x' \leq 2x' \leq x' \dot{+}^R x'$). Then, $-x < \widehat{x} < x$, hence $\widehat{x} - x < x + \widehat{x}$, thus $x - 2x < \widehat{x}$, absurd.

20. $\widehat{\widehat{x}} \leq \widehat{x}$ by 9 and 1. If, by contradiction, $\widehat{x} - \widehat{x} < \widehat{x}$, then $\widehat{x} < \widehat{x} + \widehat{x}$, contradicting 18.

21. By 12, $\widehat{x + y} = (x + y) - (x + y) \geq \widehat{x} + \widehat{y} \geq \max(\widehat{x}, \widehat{y})$. W.l.o.g., $\widehat{x} \geq \widehat{y}$. By 18, $\widehat{x} + \widehat{y} = \widehat{x}$. Assume, for contradiction, that $\widehat{x} + \widehat{y} < \widehat{x + y}$. Then, by 8,

$$\begin{aligned} x + \widehat{x + y} &> x, \\ y + \widehat{x + y} &> y. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by 17, $x + y + 2(\widehat{x + y}) > x + y$, contradicting 7. The proof that $\widehat{x \dot{+}^R y} = \widehat{x}$ is similar.

22. If, by contradiction, $x \dot{+}^R y > (x + y) \dot{+}^R x - x$, then $y > (y + x) - x$, contradicting 4.

23. By hypothesis, $\widehat{y} - \widehat{x} < \mathbf{0}$. If, by contradiction, $x \dot{+}^R \widehat{y} > x$, then $x - (x \dot{+}^R \widehat{y}) < \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $x \dot{+}^R ((-x) \perp \widehat{y}) < \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, $(x - x) \perp \widehat{y} < \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $\widehat{x} \perp \widehat{y} < \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $\widehat{y} - \widehat{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$, absurd.

24. If, by contradiction, $y < x \dot{+}^R \widehat{y}$, then $y < y \dot{+}^R (x - y)$, hence $x - y \geq \mathbf{0}$, contradicting $x < y$.

25. Immediate from 24.

26. Immediate from 18.

27. By hypothesis, $x - \widehat{z} < \mathbf{0}$ and $y - \widehat{z} < \mathbf{0}$. Hence, $(x - \widehat{z}) \dot{+}^R y - \widehat{z} < \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $(x \dot{+}^R y) - (\widehat{z} + \widehat{z}) < \mathbf{0}$, hence $(x \dot{+}^R y) - \widehat{z} < \mathbf{0}$, and the conclusion follows. $\square$

3.16 Corollary. Let $d, k, m \in \mathbb{N}$, with $k < m$, and $x, y \in M$. Then,

$$(x - (m + d)y) + (my - ky) \leq x - (d + k)y.$$

Proof. If we define $x' := x - dy$, we see that it is enough to treat the case $d = 0$. By Proposition 3.15(12),

$$(x - my) + (my - ky) \leq (x - ky) \dot{+}^R (my \perp my) = (x - ky) - \widehat{y} = x - ky. \quad \square$$

In general, we do not have equality: take for instance $M = \check{\mathbb{Q}}$, $x = 0^+$, $y = 0^-$, $k = 0$, $m = d = 1$. Then, the left hand side is equal to 0^- , while the right hand side is equal to 0^+ . Another counter-example, this time with $k > 0$: take $M = \check{\mathbb{Z}}_{(2)}$, $x = y = 1/2 \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$, $d = 0$, $k = 1$, $m = 2$. Then, the left hand side is equal to 0^- , while the right hand side is 0^+ . With the same M , x , and y , we could also take $d = m = 1$ and $k = 0$.

3.17 Corollary. *Let $x, x', y \in M$, $j, j', k, m, d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $j, j', k < m$, and $j + j' = m + d$. Then,*

$$(x - jy) + (x' - j'y) + (my - ky) \leq (x - x') - (d - k)y.$$

Proof. The left hand side is less or equal to $((x + x') - (m + d)y) + (my - ky)$, hence the conclusion is immediate from Corollary 3.16. $\square$

3.2 Sub-doms and dom-homomorphisms

3.18 Definition. An element $x \in M$ is a **width** element (or width for short) if it is equal to its width (i.e., $\hat{x} = x$). Define $W := W(M)$ as the set of widths of M : it is an ordered subset of M , and $\hat{\cdot}$ is a surjective map from M to W . Note that $\mathbf{0}$ is in W .

Given $a \in W$, define

$$M^{\{a\}} := \{x \in M : \hat{x} = a\}, \quad M^{\{\geq a\}} := \{x \in M : \hat{x} \geq a\},$$

and similarly for $M^{\{>a\}}$, $M^{\{\leq a\}}$ and $M^{\{<a\}}$. We shall write $M^{\{0\}}$ instead of $M^{\{\mathbf{0}\}} = \{x \in M : \hat{x} = \mathbf{0}\}$. More generally, for any $S \subseteq W$, define

$$M^{\{S\}} := \{x \in M : \hat{x} \in S\}.$$

3.19 Definition. A subset A of a pre-dom M is **symmetric** if $-A = A$. It is a **quasi-sub-dom** of M if it is symmetric and $A + A \subseteq A$. If moreover $\mathbf{0} \in A$, then A is a **sub-dom** of M , and M is a **super-dom** of A .

3.20 Definition. A function $\phi : M \rightarrow M'$ between two structures $(M, \leq, +, -)$ and $(M', \leq, +, -)$ is a **quasi-dom-homomorphism** if ϕ preserves the structure, i.e. $\phi(x + y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$, $\phi(-x) = -\phi(x)$, and if $x \leq y$ then $\phi(x) \leq \phi(y)$.

A function ϕ between two $\mathcal{L}$ -structures M and M' is a **dom-homomorphism** if it is a quasi-dom-homomorphism and $\phi(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$.

The **kernel** of such a dom-homomorphism ϕ is

$$\ker(\phi) := \{x \in M : \phi(x) = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

Note that a sub-dom of a dom is indeed a dom (because the axiomatisation of doms is universal) and that the corresponding inclusion map is a dom-homomorphism. Moreover, a subset of a pre-dom is a quasi-sub-dom iff the corresponding inclusion map is a quasi-dom-homomorphism.

Examples. 3.21. Let M and M' be two ordered groups, considered as doms with the group minus. A function $\phi : M \rightarrow M'$ is a dom-homomorphism iff ϕ is a homomorphism of ordered groups, and a sub-dom of M is the same as a subgroup.

3.22. Let $M := \check{\mathbb{Z}} \setminus \{\pm\infty\}$, and consider $\mathbb{Z}$ as a dom (with the group minus). The map from $\mathbb{Z}$ into M sending x to x^+ is an isomorphism of ordered groups, but it is not a dom-homomorphism, since it does not preserve the minus (cf. Example 3.13).

3.23. Let $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ be two elements not in M . Define the dom $M^\infty := M \sqcup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ with the operations and relation extending the ones on M , and, for every $x \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned} -(+\infty) &= -\infty, \\ -\infty < x < +\infty, \\ -\infty + x &= -\infty, \\ +\infty + x &= +\infty, \\ (-\infty) + (+\infty) &= -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that M^∞ is indeed a dom, and M is a convex subdom of M^∞ .

3.24 Corollary. *For every $a \in W$, the set $\{y \in M : |y| \leq a\}$ is a convex sub-dom of M . Moreover, if $a > \mathbf{0}$, then the set $\{y \in M : |y| < a\}$ is also a convex sub-dom of M .¹⁰*

Proof. By Proposition 3.15(26, 27). $\square$

Let H be a convex subgroup of G . The quotient group G/H is, in a canonical way, an ordered group, with the definition $\gamma/H \leq \lambda/H$ if there exists $\eta \in H$ such that $\gamma \leq \eta + \lambda$. Equivalently, $\gamma/H < \lambda/H$ if for every $\eta \in H$, $\gamma < \eta + \lambda$.

Fix a convex subgroup H of G , and denote by $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H$ the quotient map.

3.25 Lemma. *Let $\Lambda \in \check{G}$ such that $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$. Then,*

$$\pi^{-1}(\pi\Lambda^L) = \Lambda^L \quad \text{and} \quad \pi^{-1}(\pi\Lambda^R) = \Lambda^R.$$

Hence, the map π induces a bijection between the cuts Λ of G such that $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, and the cuts of G/H . Denote by Λ/H the cut of G/H induced by Λ .

Moreover, if $\gamma \in G$ and Γ is a cut such that $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\Gamma)$, we have:

1. $\Lambda \geq \gamma$ iff $\Lambda/H \geq \gamma/H$;
2. $\Lambda \geq \Gamma$ iff $\Lambda/H \geq \Gamma/H$;
3. $(\Lambda + \Gamma)/H = \Lambda/H + \Gamma/H$;
4. $(\Lambda +^R \Gamma)/H = \Lambda/H +^R \Gamma/H$;
5. $(\Lambda \perp \Gamma)/H = \Lambda/H \perp \Gamma/H$;
6. $(\Lambda - \Gamma)/H = \Lambda/H - \Gamma/H$;
7. $(\gamma + \Gamma)/H = \gamma/H + \Gamma/H$.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \pi^{-1}(\pi\Lambda^L)$. Then, there exists $\theta \in H$ such that $\gamma - \theta \in \Lambda^L$, i.e. $\gamma \in \theta + \Lambda^L$, i.e. $\gamma < \theta + \Lambda$. However, since $\theta \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, $\theta + \Lambda = \Lambda$, thus $\gamma < \Lambda$. Similarly for $\gamma \in \pi^{-1}(\pi\Lambda^R)$.

The first point is a consequence of the above, and the second of the first.

Let us prove, for instance, the third point (the others are similar).

Let $\alpha/H < (\Lambda + \Gamma)/H$. Hence, $\alpha < \Lambda + \Gamma$, so $\alpha = \lambda + \gamma$ for some $\lambda < \Lambda$, $\gamma < \Gamma$, thus $\alpha/H = \lambda/H + \gamma/H < \Lambda/H + \Gamma/H$. Therefore, $(\Lambda + \Gamma)/H \leq \Lambda/H + \Gamma/H$.

Let $\alpha/H < \Lambda/H + \Gamma/H$. Hence, $\alpha/H = \lambda/H + \gamma/H$ for some $\lambda < \Lambda$, $\gamma < \Gamma$, thus $\alpha + \theta = \lambda + \gamma$ for some $\theta \in H$, i.e. $\alpha + \theta < \Lambda + \Gamma$, so $\alpha < \Lambda + \Gamma$. Therefore, $(\Lambda + \Gamma)/H \geq \Lambda/H + \Gamma/H$. $\square$

¹⁰If $a = \mathbf{0}$, it is the empty set.

3.26 Remark. Let $\pi : G \rightarrow K$ be a surjective homomorphism between two ordered groups. By the above lemma, π induces a map $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{K} \rightarrow \tilde{G}$, via the formula

$$\tilde{\pi}(\Lambda) := (\pi^{-1}(\Lambda^L))^+ = (\pi^{-1}(\Lambda^R))^- = (\pi^{-1}(\Lambda^L), \pi^{-1}(\Lambda^R)).$$

Moreover, $\tilde{\pi}$ is an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism. Finally, $\tilde{}$ is a contravariant functor between the categories of ordered (Abelian) groups with surjective homomorphisms, and doms with injective quasi-dom-homomorphisms.

Note that if π is not surjective, then $\tilde{\pi}$ can be still defined by the same formula, but it will not preserve the sum.

3.27 Corollary. $M^{\{0\}}$ is a sub-dom of M . More generally, for any $S \subseteq W$, $M^{\{S\}}$ is a quasi-sub-dom of M . Moreover, if $\mathbf{0} \in S$, then $M^{\{S\}}$ is a sub-dom of M .

Examples. 3.28. Let a be a width. Then, by Corollary 3.27, $M^{\{\geq a\}}$ and $M^{\{>a\}}$ are quasi-sub-doms of M . By Proposition 3.15(23 and 9), $M^{\{\geq a\}}$ is actually a dom, with neutral element $\hat{a}$. However, the only case when $M^{\{\geq a\}}$ is a sub-dom of M is when $a = \mathbf{0}$, and in that case $M^{\{\geq a\}} = M$.

3.29. Fix a width a . Then, $M^{\{\leq a\}}$ and $M^{\{<a\}}$ are sub-doms of M (unless $a = \mathbf{0}$, because in that case the second set is empty).

3.30 Corollary. Let $\phi : M \rightarrow N$ be a dom-homomorphism. Then, $\ker(\phi)$ is a convex submonoid of M . If moreover $\delta = \mathbf{0}$ in N , then $\ker(\phi)$ is a convex subdom of M . Moreover, if $y \in N$, then $\phi^{-1}(y) + \ker(\phi) \subseteq \phi^{-1}(y)$ and $\phi^{-1}(y) - \ker(\phi) \subseteq \phi^{-1}(y)$.

Note that if $\delta < \mathbf{0}$ (in N), neither $\ker(\phi)$ nor $\ker(\phi) \cup -\ker(\phi)$ are, in general, subdoms of M .

See §4.1 for more on dom-homomorphisms.

3.3 Type of doms

3.31 Definition. M is of the **first type** if $\delta = \mathbf{0}$. It is of the **second type** if $\delta + \delta < \delta$. It is of the **third type** if $\delta + \delta = \delta < \mathbf{0}$.

3.32 Remark. The classification of doms into first, second and third type is a partition of the class of doms (namely, every dom has exactly one type by 3.15(2)).

Moreover, M is of the same type as its dual, and if N is a sub-dom of M , then M and N are of the same type.

3.33 Example. The doms G and $\tilde{G}$ (see Example 3.12) are of the first type. Moreover, $\tilde{G}$ is of the second type iff G has a minimal positive element,¹¹ otherwise it is of the third type.

3.34 Lemma. Assume that M is of the first type. Then $x - \delta = x = x + \delta$. Moreover, if $\hat{x} = \mathbf{0}$, then $x + (-x) = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. $x - \delta = x - \mathbf{0} = x$. Moreover, $x + \delta = x + \mathbf{0} = x$.

Finally, if $\hat{x} = \mathbf{0}$, then $x + (-x) = -\hat{x} = \delta = \mathbf{0}$. □

3.35 Lemma. Assume that M is of the second type, and let $x \in M$ such that $\hat{x} = \mathbf{0}$.

1. $x - \delta > x > x + \delta$;

¹¹This is equivalent to G being discrete and non-trivial.

2. moreover, $x + (-x - \delta) = \mathbf{0}$.
3. For any $y \in M$, $(y - \delta) + \delta = y = (y + \delta) - \delta$.

Proof. 1. If, for contradiction, $x - \delta \leq x$, then $x - (x - \delta) \geq \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $x +^R(-x + \delta) \geq \mathbf{0}$.

By Proposition 3.15(22), the left hand side is less or equal than $(x +^L x + \delta) - \delta$, therefore $(-\widehat{x} + \delta) - \delta \geq \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $2\delta - \delta \geq \mathbf{0}$. Thus, $2\delta \geq \delta$, hence $2\delta = \delta$, absurd.

The second inequality is the dual of the first one.

2. $x + (-x - \delta) \leq -\widehat{x} - \delta = \widehat{\delta} = \mathbf{0}$. If, for contradiction, $x + (-x - \delta) < \mathbf{0}$, then $x + (-x - \delta) \leq \delta$, i.e. $x \leq \delta - (-x - \delta) = x + \delta$, contradicting the previous point.
3. Let us prove the first equality. If $\widehat{y} > \mathbf{0}$, it is obvious, since in that case $y + \delta = y - \delta = y$. Otherwise, by the previous inequalities, $y - \delta > y \geq (y - \delta) + \delta$. Moreover, there can be only one element in the interval $[(y - \delta) + \delta, y - \delta)$, hence $(y - \delta) + \delta = y$. The other equality is the dual. $\square$

Therefore, we have proved that, in the case when M is of the first or second type, $M^{\{\mathbf{0}\}} = \{x \in M : \widehat{x} = \mathbf{0}\}$ is an ordered group. Note that in the first type case the group inverse of x (with $\widehat{x} = \mathbf{0}$) is precisely $-x$. In the second type case, instead, the inverse of x is not $-x$, but $-x - \delta$, which is strictly greater than $-x$. Moreover, if M is of the second type, then $M^{\{\mathbf{0}\}}$ is discrete, with minimal positive element $\mathbf{0} +^R \mathbf{0}$.

3.4 Associated group and multiplicity

3.36 Definition. Define $F^+ : M \rightarrow M$ as $F^+(x) := (x + \delta) - \delta$. Define moreover $x \equiv y$ if $F^+(x) = F^+(y)$, and $[x]$ to be the equivalence class of x .

Define also $F^- : M \rightarrow M$ as $F^-(x) := (x - \delta) + \delta$.

Note that F^- is the dual operation of F^+ , namely $F^-(x) = -F^+(-x)$. Hence, all theorems about F^+ have a dual theorem about F^- , and we will usually prove (and often also state) only one of the two forms.

3.37 Lemma. 1. $x \leq F^+(x) \leq x - \delta$; therefore, $F^-(x) \leq F^+(x)$;

2. if $x \leq y$, then $F^+(x) \leq F^+(y)$ and $F^-(x) \leq F^-(y)$;

3. if $\widehat{x} > \mathbf{0}$, then $F^+(x) = x$;

4. $\widehat{F^+(x)} = \widehat{x}$;

5. the interval $(F^-(x), F^+(x))$ is empty;

6. $F^+(F^+(x)) = F^+(x)$;

7. if M is of the first or second type, then F^+ is the identity;

8. $F^+(F^-(x)) = F^+(x)$;

9. $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation;

10. if $\widehat{x} > \mathbf{0}$, then $[x] = \{x\}$;

11. the only elements of $[x]$ are $F^-(x)$ and $F^+(x)$ (which might coincide); in particular, all elements of M are either of the form $F^+(y)$ or of the form $F^-(y)$;

12. the equivalence relation induced by F^+ is the same as the one induced by F^- ; namely, $F^+(y) = F^+(y')$ iff $F^-(y) = F^-(y')$;

13. $x \equiv y$ iff $x - \delta = y - \delta$.

In general, if $x \equiv x'$ and $y \equiv y'$, then

14. $x + y \equiv x' + y'$;

15. $-x \equiv -x'$.

Proof. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9 are obvious.

5. Assume for contradiction that $F^-(x) < y < F^+(x)$. By 1 and Proposition 3.15(25), $y = x$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.15(17), $F^-(x) +^R x < x + F^+(x)$, i.e. $F^-(x) +^R \hat{x} < F^+(x)$. Thus, by 1, $(x + \delta) +^R \hat{x} < (x + \delta) - \delta$, hence $\hat{x} < -\delta$, absurd.

6. Immediate from Proposition 3.15(6).

7. Trivial from Lemmata 3.35 and 3.34.

8. If M is of the first or second type, the conclusion follows immediately from 7. Otherwise,

$$F^+(F^-(x)) = ((x - \delta) + 2\delta) - \delta = ((x - \delta) + \delta) - \delta = x - \delta \geq F^+(x).$$

10. Immediate from 3 and 4.

11. From 6 and 8 we see that $F^-(x)$ and $F^+(x)$ are both in $[x]$. Let $y, y' \in [x]$. If $y' > y$, then $F^+(y) = F^+(y') \geq y' > y$, hence, by 5, $y' = F^+(y)$. Therefore, $F^-(y') = F^-(F^+(y)) = F^-(y)$, and as before we can conclude that $y = F^-(y')$.

12. Immediate from 11.

13. If $\hat{x} > 0$, then $x - \delta = x$, and therefore $x - \delta = y - \delta$ iff $x = y$. Thus, we can conclude using 3. Suppose instead that $\hat{x} = 0$. If M is of the first or second type, then $M^{\{0\}}$ is a group. Therefore, $x - \delta = y - \delta$ iff $x = y$, and the conclusion follows from 7. Finally, if M is of the third type, then

$$F^+(x) \leq x - \delta \leq F^+(x) - \delta = (x + \delta) - 2\delta = (x + \delta) - \delta = F^+(x),$$

hence $F^+(x) = x - \delta$, and we are done.

14. It suffices to prove the case when $y' = y$. Moreover, if $x' \neq x$, by 11, we can assume that $x' = F^+(x)$. Since $x' \geq x$, $F^+(x' + y) \geq F^+(x + y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F^+(x' + y) &= (((x + \delta) \overset{\text{switch}}{-\delta}) + y + \delta) - \delta \leq \\ &\leq (((x + y + \delta) - \delta) + \delta) - \delta = F^+(F^+(x + y)) = F^+(x + y). \end{aligned}$$

15. If M is of the first or second type, then the conclusion is immediate from 7.

Otherwise, if M is of the third type, then, as before, we can assume that $x' = F^+(x) > x$. Hence, $F^+(-x') \leq F^+(-x)$. Let $z := -x$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} F^+(-x') &= ((z - \delta) + 2\delta) - \delta = ((z - \delta) + \delta) - \delta = \\ &= F^+(z - \delta) \geq F^+(z) = F^+(-x). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

3.38 Lemma. *Let $\sim$ be an equivalence relation on M such that for every $x, x', y \in M$ such that $x \sim x'$:*

1. $-x \sim -x'$;
2. $x + y \sim x' + y$;
3. *if $x \leq y \leq x'$, then $y \sim x$.*

Then, $M/\sim$ inherits an $\mathcal{L}$ -structure from M . Moreover, $M/\sim$ is a dom, and the quotient map $M \rightarrow M/\sim$ is a dom-homomorphism.

Proof. Trivial checks. □

By Lemmata 3.37 and 3.38, the $\mathcal{L}$ -structure on M induces a well-defined $\mathcal{L}$ -structure on the quotient $M/\equiv$, and the quotient map π sending x to $[x]$ is a dom-homomorphism.¹²

3.39 Lemma. *If M is of the first or third type, then $M/\equiv$ is of the first type. If M is of the second type, then $M/\equiv$ is also of the second type. Therefore, the set $G(M) := (M/\equiv)^{\{0\}}$ is an ordered group.*

Proof. If M is of the first or second type, then the quotient map is the identity, and the conclusion is trivial. Otherwise, $2\delta = \delta < 0$ (in M). We have to prove that $-[0] = [0]$, i.e. that $F^+(\delta) = 0$. In fact, $F^+(\delta) = 2\delta - \delta = \delta - \delta = 0$. □

3.40 Definition. The ordered group $G(M)$ defined above is the **group associated** to M . The cardinality of $[x]$ (as a subset of M) is the **multiplicity** of x . For every $x \in M^{\{0\}}$, x is a **simple point** iff it has multiplicity 1, otherwise it is a **double point**.

Note that the multiplicity of x is either 1 or 2, and it can be 2 only if M is of the third type. Moreover, if M is of the second type, then $G(M)$ is discrete. In §5 we will show that under some additional conditions, there is an important correlation between M , $\widetilde{G(M)}$ (see Example 3.12) and $\widetilde{G(M)}$.

3.5 Signature

In this section, M will be a dom of the third type, unless we explicitly say otherwise.

3.41 Definition-Lemma. Let $x \in M^{\{0\}}$. There are exactly 3 distinct possible cases:

1. $x + \delta = x < x - \delta$;
2. $x + \delta = x = x - \delta$;
3. $x + \delta < x = x - \delta$.

In the first case, we say that the signature of x is $\text{sign}(x) := -1$, in the second case the signature is 0, in the third $+1$. Moreover,

1. $\text{sign}(x) = 0$ iff x is a simple point;¹³
2. $\text{sign}(x) = -1$ iff x is a double point and $x < F^+(x)$, iff $x - \delta > x$;

¹²See Lemma 4.1 and Remark 4.2 for more on dom-homomorphisms and equivalence relations.

¹³See Definition 3.40.

3. $\text{sign}(x) = 1$ iff x is a double point and $x = F^+(x)$, iff $x + \delta < x$;
4. $\text{sign}(x) \geq 0$ iff $x - \delta = x$;
5. $\text{sign}(x) \leq 0$ iff $x + \delta = x$;
6. $\text{sign}(x) = 0$ iff $x + \delta = x - \delta$, and $\text{sign}(x) \neq 0$ iff $x + \delta < x - \delta$;
7. $\text{sign}(0) = 1$, $\text{sign}(\delta) = -1$;
8. $\text{sign}(F^+(x)) \geq 0$ and $\text{sign}(F^-(x)) \leq 0$.

Proof. Easy. □

3.42 Example. If $M = \check{G}$ for some dense group G , and $\Lambda \in M^{\{0\}}$, then $\text{sign}(\Lambda) = 1$ iff $\Lambda = \lambda^+$ (for some $\lambda \in G$), $\text{sign}(\Lambda) = -1$ iff $\Lambda = \lambda^-$, $\text{sign}(\Lambda) = 0$ otherwise.

3.43 Proposition (Signature rule). Let $x, y \in M^{\{0\}}$. Then, $\text{sign}(-x) = -\text{sign}(x)$. Moreover, define $\alpha := \text{sign}(x)$, $\beta := \text{sign}(y)$, and $\gamma := \text{sign}(x + y)$. Then:

1. if $\alpha = \beta = 1$, then $\gamma = 1$;
2. if $\alpha = \beta = -1$, then $\gamma = -1$;
3. if $\alpha \leq 0$, then $\gamma \leq 0$;
4. if $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta \geq 0$, then $\gamma \geq 0$;
5. if $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$, then $\gamma = 0$;
6. if $\alpha = -1$ and $\beta = 0$, then $\gamma = 0$;
7. if $\alpha = \beta = 0$, then $\gamma \leq 0$; ¹⁴
8. if $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = -1$, then $\gamma = -1$.

Proof. 1. Since $x + \delta < x$ and $y + \delta < y$, then, by Proposition 3.15(17), $x + \delta + y + \delta < x + y$, i.e. $x + y + \delta < x + y$, and the conclusion follows.

2. Since $x - \delta > x$ and $y - \delta > y$, then, by Proposition 3.15(17), $x - \delta +^R y - \delta < x + y$, thus $(x + y) - \delta < x + y$, and the conclusion follows.

3. Since $x + \delta = x$, then $(x + y) + \delta = (x + \delta) + y = x + y$.

4. *Claim 1.* $(x + \delta) +^R y = x + y$.

Since $x + \delta < x$, then, by Proposition 3.15(14), $(x + \delta) +^R y \leq x + y$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.15(11), $(x + \delta) +^R y \geq x + (y +^R \delta) = x + y$.

Therefore, $(x + y) - \delta = (x + \delta) +^R y - \delta$, and, since $\beta \geq 0$, the latter is equal to $(x + \delta) +^R y = x + y$.

5. Immediate from 3 and 4.

6. 3 implies that $\gamma \leq 0$. Moreover, the dual of Claim 1 implies that $(x - \delta) + y = x +^R y$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $(x + y) - \delta > x + y$. Therefore, $x + y < x +^R y - \delta = x +^R y = (x - \delta) + y$. Let $z := x - \delta$. We have $z \equiv x$, hence $x + y \equiv z + y$, thus $\text{sign}(z) = 1$ and $\text{sign}(z + y) = 1$, contradicting 5.

¹⁴Both $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma = -1$ are possible. For instance, take $G = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$: if $x = y = 1/2$, then $x + y = 1^-$; if $x = y = 1/4$, then $x + y = 1/2$.

7. Immediate from 3.

8. By 3, $\gamma \leq 0$. By hypothesis, $x + \delta < x$ and $y < y - \delta$, hence $x + y + \delta < x + (y - \delta)$. The latter is less or equal to $(x + y) - \delta$, and we deduce that $\gamma \neq 0$. $\square$

We will now define the signature of x in the case when M is not of the third type, or $x \notin M^{\{0\}}$.

3.44 Definition. Let M be a dom, $y \in M$, and $x \in M^{\{0\}}$. If M is of the second type, then $\text{sign}(x) := \infty$. If M is of the first type, then $\text{sign}(x) := \spadesuit$. Note that $y \in M^{\{\geq \hat{y}\}}$. Define $\text{sign}(y)$ as the signature of y in $M^{\{\geq \hat{y}\}}$.

Note that if $y \notin M^{\{0\}}$, then $\text{sign}(y) \neq \spadesuit$. Equivalently, if $\hat{y} > \mathbf{0}$, then $M^{\{\geq \hat{y}\}}$ cannot be of the first type. Moreover, if $\hat{y} > \hat{x}$, then $\text{sign}(x + y) = \text{sign}(y)$.

The above definition of signature coincides with Tressl's definition in [13], except that we introduced the $\spadesuit$ symbol for doms of the first type, which he does not treat in his article.

3.45 Definition. Let M be a dom of the third type. Let $D(M)$ be the set of $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ with multiplicity 2, and $H(M)$ be the image of $D(M)$ in $G(M)$ via the quotient map π .

3.46 Lemma. $D(M)$ is a sub-dom of M , and $H(M)$ is a subgroup of $G(M)$. Moreover, for every $x \in D(M)$ and $y \in M$, $x + y \in D(M)$ iff $y \in D(M)$ iff $x +^R y \in D(M)$.

Proof. Immediate consequence of Lemma 3.41 and Proposition 3.43. $\square$

3.6 Proper and trivial doms

3.47 Definition. M is a **proper dom** if for every $x < y \in M$ there exists $z \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $x \leq z \leq y$.

It is **strongly proper** if it is proper, and for every $y \in M^{\{>0\}}$ there exists $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $\mathbf{0} < x < \hat{y}$.

3.48 Remark. A dom M is strongly proper iff for every $x < y \in M$ such that $\hat{y} > \mathbf{0}$ there exists $z \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $x < z < y$.

3.49 Lemma. Let $x, y \in M$. Then, $x +^R y \leq (x +^R \hat{x}) + (y +^R \hat{y})$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.15, $x +^R y \leq (x + y) +^R \hat{x}$. If $\hat{x} \neq \hat{y}$, then $x +^R y = x + y$, and we are done. Otherwise, define $M' := M^{\{\geq \hat{x}\}}$: x and y are in M' , and $\hat{x} = \hat{y} = \mathbf{0}_{M'}$. By splitting into cases according to the type of M' we can easily prove the lemma.¹⁵ $\square$

3.50 Definition. Let P be an ordered group containing $G := G(M)$.

For every $a \in M^{\{>0\}}$, define $\Lambda_P(a) \in \check{P}$ by

$$\Lambda_P(a) := \{x \in P : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} x \leq [y] \text{ \& } y < a\}^+.$$

Moreover, we will write Λ for Λ_G .

3.51 Lemma. Let M be a proper dom, $G := G(M)$, and P be an ordered group containing G . Assume that for every $a \in M^{\{>0\}}$ there is no $x \in P$ such that, for all $y, y' \in M^{\{0\}}$, $y < a < y'$ implies $[y] < x < [y']$. Then, the map $\Lambda_P : M^{\{>0\}} \rightarrow \check{P}$ is an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism.

¹⁵Problem: give an easy proof of the lemma without distinguishing the various cases.

Note that if M is proper, then $P = G(M)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the lemma.

Proof. Λ_P preserves the minus, because

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_P(-a) &= \{x \in P : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} x \leq [y] \ \& \ y < -a\}^+ = \\ &= \{-x' \in P : \exists y' \in M^{\{0\}} x' \geq [y'] \ \& \ y' > a\}^+ = \\ &= -\{x' \in P : \exists y' \in M^{\{0\}} x' \geq [y'] \ \& \ y' > a\}^- = -\Lambda_P(a).\end{aligned}$$

Λ_P is injective and preserves the order, because if $a < a' \in M^{\{>0\}}$, then there exists $y_0 \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $a < y_0 < a'$. Moreover,

$$\{x \in P : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} x \leq [y] \ \& \ y < a\} \subset \{x \in P : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} x \leq [y] \ \& \ y < a'\},$$

and $[y_0]$ is not in the former set. Hence, $\Lambda_P(a) < [y_0] < \Lambda_P(a')$.

Finally, Λ_P preserves the sum. Let a and $a' \in A$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_P(a) + \Lambda_P(a') &= \{x + x' : \exists y, y' \in M^{\{0\}} x \leq [y] \ \& \ y < a \ \& \ x' \leq [y'] \ \& \ y' < a'\}^+ \leq \\ &\leq \{x'' \in P : \exists y'' \in M^{\{0\}} x'' \leq [y''] \ \& \ y'' < a + a'\}^+ = \Lambda_P(a + a').\end{aligned}$$

Assume, for contradiction, that $\Lambda_P(a) + \Lambda_P(a') < x_0 < \Lambda_P(a + a')$ for some $x_0 \in P$. Then, for every $x, x' \in P$ such that there exist $y, y' \in M^{\{0\}}$ satisfying $x \leq [y] < [a]$ and $x' \leq [y'] < [a']$, we have $x + x' < x_0$. Moreover, $x_0 < \Lambda_P(a + a')$, i.e. there exists $y'' \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $x_0 \leq [y''] < [a + a']$.

Hence, for every $y, y' \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $y < a$ and $y' < a'$, we have $y + y' < y'' < a + a'$. Since $y'' < a + a'$, we have $y'' - a < a'$. Moreover, both a' and $y'' - a$ are in $M^{\{>0\}}$. Hence, there exists $z' \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $y'' - a < z' < a'$. Therefore, $y'' - z' < a$. Define $z := y'' - z'$, $y := z +^R \mathbf{0}$, and $y' := z' +^R \mathbf{0}$. Since z and z' are in $M^{\{0\}}$, $z < a$ and $z' < a'$, we have also $y, y' \in M^{\{0\}}$, $y < a$ and $y' < a'$, therefore $y + y' < y''$. By Lemma 3.49, $z +^R z' \leq y + y'$, hence $z +^R z' < y''$. However, $z +^R z' = y'' - z' +^R z' = y'' +^R \mathbf{0} \geq y''$, absurd. $\square$

Note that Λ is not a dom-homomorphism, because either it does not preserve the neutral element, or $M^{\{>0\}}$ has no neutral element.

3.52 Question. What happens if M is not proper? Does Λ still preserve the sum?

3.53 Remark. Let M be a strongly proper dom and P be an ordered group containing $G := G(M)$. Assume moreover the following hypothesis:

- (*) For every $x \in P \setminus G$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ in G , there exist γ and $\gamma' \in G$ such that $\gamma < x < \gamma'$ and $\gamma' - \gamma \leq \varepsilon$.

Then, M and P satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 3.51.¹⁶

Proof. Assume for contradiction that there exist $a \in M^{\{>0\}}$ and $x_0 \in P$ such that

$$\{x \in P : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} x \leq [y] \ \& \ y < a\}^+ < x_0 < \{x' \in P : \exists y' \in M^{\{0\}} x' \geq [y'] \ \& \ y' > a\}^-.$$

Let $y_0 \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $\mathbf{0} < y_0 < \widehat{a}$ (it exists because M is strongly proper). Since x_0 cannot be in G , we can find $y, y' \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $[y] < x_0 < [y']$ and $y' - y \leq y_0$. Therefore, $y < a < y'$, thus $y' - y \geq \widehat{a} > y_0$, absurd. $\square$

¹⁶**Question:** Does there exist a proper dom M with a non-trivial associated group G and an super-group P of G , such that M and P satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 3.51, but not (*)?

In §5.5 we will see more on proper doms, and some applications of the above results.

3.54 Definition. M is a **trivial dom** if

$$x + y = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| > |y|, \\ y & \text{if } |x| < |y|, \\ \min(x, y) & \text{if } |x| = |y|. \end{cases}$$

3.55 Remark. The only trivial doms are the ones shown in examples 3.10 and 3.11.

3.56 Remark. M is trivial iff $\forall x \in M \hat{x} = |x|$.

3.57 Remark. Let $(M, \leq, \mathbf{0}, -)$ be a structure, such that $\leq$ is a linear ordering of M , $\mathbf{0}$ is an element of M , and $- : M \rightarrow M$ is an anti-automorphism of $(M, \leq)$, such that $-(-x) = x$. Assume moreover that M satisfies axioms **MA** and **MB**. Then, there exists a unique binary operation $+$ on M such that $(M, \leq, \mathbf{0}, +, -)$ is a *trivial dom*.

Proof. $x + y$ is defined as in Definition 3.54. □

Examples. 3.58. If M is a trivial dom, then M^∞ (defined in Example 3.23) is also trivial.

3.59. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ there exists exactly one (up to dom-isomorphisms) dom with n elements, which we will denote by $\mathbf{n}$. Moreover, once we fix a linear ordering of the set of n elements, there is only one dom *tout court* which subsumes the given order. The existence and uniqueness is proved by induction on n , starting with the doms with 1 and 2 elements, and proceeding from n to $n + 2$ using Example 3.23 and Proposition 3.15(27). Moreover, by Example 3.58, $\mathbf{n}$ must be trivial.

3.60. The finite doms **1**, **2**, **3** and **4** are the only doms which are both trivial and proper.

3.61. If G is a densely ordered group, then $\tilde{G}$ is a proper dom of the first type, but not a strongly proper one. For any ordered group G , the dom $G \times \mathbf{4}$ (with lexicographic order and component-wise plus and minus: cf. §4.6) is a proper dom of the third type, but not a strongly proper one. On the other hand, every proper dom of the second type is also strongly proper.

4 Constructions on doms

To understand the constructions in this section, the reader is advised to try them in the cases when M is equal either to G , or to $\tilde{G}$, or to $\tilde{\tilde{G}}$, for some ordered group G .

4.1 Morphisms and quotients

We will now study quotients and maps of doms. We have seen in Lemma 3.38 that under suitable conditions an equivalence relation $\sim$ on a dom M induces a dom structure on the quotient $M/\sim$. We will call an equivalence relation $\sim$ on a dom M a **dom-equivalence relation** if $\sim$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 3.38.

We will now prove the analogue for doms of some basic theorems for groups.

4.1 Lemma. Let $\phi : M \rightarrow N$ be a dom-homomorphism. Then, ϕ is injective iff $\ker(\phi) = \{0\}$. Moreover, if ϕ is not injective, then $\ker(\phi)$ is a sub-dom of M , and N is of the first type.

Proof. Easy. □

4.2 Remark. In particular, if $\sim$ is a non-trivial dom-equivalence relation on M , then the quotient map is a dom-homomorphism with non-trivial kernel, thus $M/\sim$ is a dom of the first type.

We will now show that every convex sub-dom of M defines an equivalence relation.

4.3 Definition (Quotients). Let N be a convex sub-dom of M . Define an equivalence relation $\overset{N}{\sim}$ on M in the following way:

$x \overset{N}{\sim} y$ if there exist $w_1, w_2 \in N$ such that $y + w_1 \leq x \leq x \dot{+}^R w_2$.¹⁷

We will write M/N instead of $M/\overset{N}{\sim}$.

4.4 Lemma. Let N be a convex sub-dom of M . The binary relation $\overset{N}{\sim}$ on M is indeed a dom-equivalence relation on M . Finally, the quotient map $\pi : M \rightarrow M/N$ is a surjective dom-homomorphism, with kernel N .

Proof. Easy. □

4.5 Lemma. Let P be a dom of the first type, $\phi : M \rightarrow P$ be a dom-homomorphism, and $N := \ker(\phi)$. Then, the map $\bar{\phi} : M/N \rightarrow P$ sending the equivalence class $[x]_N$ to $\phi(x)$ is a well-defined injective dom-homomorphism.

Proof. If $x \overset{N}{\sim} y$, then $y + w_1 \leq x \leq y \dot{+}^R w_2$ for some $w_1, w_2 \in N$. Therefore,

$$\phi(y) = \phi(y + w_1) \leq \phi(x) \leq \phi(y \dot{+}^R w_2) = \phi(y) \dot{+}^R \delta_P = \phi(y).$$

Thus, $\bar{\phi}$ is well-defined.

If $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$, then $\phi(x - y) = \phi(y - x) = 0_P$. Let $w_1 = x \dot{-}^L y$, $w_2 = x - y$. Hence, $y + w_1 = x \dot{-}^L \hat{y} \leq x$, and $y \dot{+}^R w_2 = x \dot{+}^R \hat{y} \geq x$. Moreover, $\phi(w_1) = \phi(w_2) = 0_P$, thus $x \overset{N}{\sim} y$. Therefore, $\bar{\phi}$ is injective.

The fact that $\bar{\phi}$ is a dom-homomorphism is trivial. □

Therefore, we can identify the image of ϕ with $M/\ker(\phi)$. Moreover, there is a bijection between convex sub-doms of M and dom-equivalence relations on M , given by the map $N \mapsto \overset{N}{\sim}$.

4.6 Remark. Let M be a dom of the third type, N a dom of the first type, and $\phi : M \rightarrow N$ a dom-homomorphism. Then, ϕ factors uniquely through $\equiv$. Namely, there exists a unique function $\dot{\phi} : M/\equiv \rightarrow N$ such that $\dot{\phi}([x]) = \phi(x)$.

Proof. In light of Lemma 4.5, the conclusion is equivalent to the fact that every dom-equivalence relation $\sim$ such that $M/\sim$ is of the first type is a coarsening of $\equiv$. Namely, if $x \equiv y$, then $x \sim y$. Since a dom-equivalence relation is uniquely determined by the equivalence class of 0 , it suffices to treat the case when $x \equiv 0$, that is $x = 0$ or $x = \delta$. Since N is of the first type, in both cases $\phi(x) = 0$. □

¹⁷ Actually, we do not need N to be convex to define $\overset{N}{\sim}$. However, the equivalence relation defined by N is the same as the one defined by the convex closure of N .

4.2 Compatible families of morphisms

In the following, when two or more pre-doms M, N are involved, we will sometimes need to distinguish the zero of M from the one of N : we will then use the notation $\mathbf{0}_M$ and δ_M for the zero of M and its opposite.

Moreover, we will sometimes need to split Axiom **MC** into two parts:

MC(a). If $x < y$ then $x - y < \mathbf{0}$.

MC(b). If $x - y < \mathbf{0}$ then $x < y$.

For, convenience, we will give a name to the following axiom of pre-doms:

PA. If $z < z'$, then $z + t \leq z' + t$.

4.7 Remark. For a pre-dom, Axiom **MC(b)** is equivalent to $\forall x \hat{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$.

4.8 Definition (Extensible group). For every dom M , we will denote by $\mathcal{E}(M)$ the following ordered group:

- $\{0\}$, if M of the first type;
- $G(M)$, if M is of the second type;
- $H(M)$, if M is of the third type.

As a dom, the minus of $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is the group minus (which can be different from the one induced by M). Note that the structure $(\mathcal{E}(M), \leq, 0, +)$ (i.e. the additive structure of the group) has a natural embedding in $(M, \leq, 0, +)$, sending x to x^+ , the maximum of x as a subset of M .

4.9 Notation. Let $k \in W(M)$. For $x \in M^{\{\geq k\}}$, define $[x]_k$ to be the equivalence class of x in $M^{\{\geq k\}}$.

4.10 Definition (Compatible families). Let M be an arbitrary dom, N be a dom of the second or third type, and O be a final segment of $W(N)$. Let Θ be a sequence $(\theta_i)_{i \in O}$ of dom-homomorphisms s.t. each θ_i maps M in a subgroup of $\mathcal{E}(N^{\{\geq i\}})$. We say that Θ is a **compatible** family from M to N (or that the θ_i are compatible), if for every $k < j \in O$

$$\theta_j(x) = [j + \theta_k(x)^+]_j. \quad (4.1)$$

Note that if O has a minimum k , and $\theta_k : M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(N^{\{\geq k\}})$ is a dom-homomorphism, then there exists a unique compatible family $\Theta(\theta_i)_{i \in O}$ containing θ_k : each θ_j is defined via the formula (4.1).

4.11 Lemma. Let $k \in W(M)$. Define the map $S_k : M \rightarrow M^{\{\geq k\}} / \equiv$ sending y to $[y + k]_k$. Then, S_k is a dom-homomorphism. Moreover, the kernel of S_k is $[-k, k]$. Besides, if $k > 0$, then $S_k(M^{< k}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(M^{\{\geq k\}})$. Finally, for every $\Lambda > -\infty$ cut of $W(M)$, the family $(S_k \upharpoonright M^{\{\Lambda^L\}})_{k > \Lambda}$ is a compatible family from $M^{\{\Lambda^L\}}$ to $M^{\{\Lambda^R\}}$.

Proof. Easy. □

We will see in the rest of this section various applications of the above construction.

4.3 Gluing

4.12 Definition (Gluing of doms). Let M , N , and O be as in Definition 4.10, and $\Theta = (\theta_i)_{i \in O}$ be a compatible family of homomorphisms from M to N . We define $M \dagger_{\Theta} N$ as the set $M \sqcup N^{\{O\}}$, endowed with the following structure on the language $(\leq, 0, +, -)$:

- the zero of $M \dagger_{\Theta} N$ is 0_M ;
- the order, the sum and the minus extend the ones on M and N ;
- if $x \in M$ and $y \in N$, then $x + y = y + x = \theta_{\hat{y}}(x)^+ +_N y \in N$, and $x < y$ iff $\theta_{\hat{y}}(x)^+ \leq_N y$.

If O has a minimum k , we will write $M \dagger_{\theta_k} N$ for $M \dagger_{\Theta} N$, where Θ is the unique compatible family containing θ_k .

Note that the hypothesis of N being of the second or third type is necessary only when $O = W(N)$.

4.13 Lemma. $M \dagger_{\Theta} N$ is a dom of the same type as M . Moreover, M is a convex sub-dom and N a quasi-sub-dom of $M \dagger_{\Theta} N$ via the inclusion maps. Besides, $(W(M), O)$ is a cut of $W(M \dagger_{\Theta} N)$. Finally, $M = (M \dagger_{\Theta} N)^{\{<O\}}$ and $N^{\{O\}} = (M \dagger_{\Theta} N)^{\{O\}}$.

Proof. The correctness of our definition (i.e. the well-definedness of $\leq$), as well as the monoid properties, the involutiveness of $-$ and axioms **MA** and **MB** are trivial.

The proof of monotonicity for $+$ is nothing but a boring enumeration of cases: we will prove, as an example, that $a \leq b \rightarrow a + c \leq b + c$, when $a \in N$ and $b, c \in M$. For $a \leq b$ implies, by definition, $a < \theta_{\hat{a}}(b)^+$, and $a + \theta_{\hat{a}}(c)^+ < \theta_{\hat{a}}(b)^+ + \theta_{\hat{a}}(c)^+$ (since we have $\leq$ by the monotonicity of $+$ on N , and, if by contradiction equality holds, then we will have $a = [a]_{\hat{a}}^+$, but in that case $a < \theta_{\hat{a}}(b)^+$ implies $[a]_{\hat{a}} < \theta_{\hat{a}}(b)$; now $\theta_{\hat{a}}(b)^+ + \theta_{\hat{a}}(c)^+ = \theta_{\hat{a}}(b + c)^+$, and, substituting the right side, the previous inequality becomes $a + \theta_{\hat{a}}(c)^+ < \theta_{\hat{a}}(b + c)^+$, which is just the definition of $a + c \leq b + c$).

Let us prove that $-$ is anti-monotone: i.e. that if $a < b$, then $-a > -b$. We will treat only the case when $a \in M$ and $b \in N$ (the other cases are either trivial or similar to this one). By definition, $\theta_{\hat{b}}(a)^+ \leq_N b$. We must prove that $\theta_{\hat{b}}(-a)^+ >_N -b$. Since $\theta_{\hat{b}}$ is a dom-homomorphism, $\theta_{\hat{b}}(-a) = -_G \theta_{\hat{b}}(a)$, where $-_G$ is the group minus of $G(N^{\{\geq \hat{b}\}})$. Moreover,

$$(-_G \theta_{\hat{b}}(a))^+ = \begin{cases} -(\theta_{\hat{b}}(a)^-) & \text{if } N^{\{\geq \hat{b}\}} \text{ is of the third type,} \\ -(\theta_{\hat{b}}(a)^+) + 1_{\hat{b}} & \text{if } N^{\{\geq \hat{b}\}} \text{ is of the second type,} \end{cases}$$

where $1_{\hat{b}}$ is the minimal positive element of $N^{\{\geq \hat{b}\}}$. Hence, we must prove that $\theta_{\hat{b}}(a)^- <_N b$ if $N^{\{\geq \hat{b}\}}$ is of the third type, or that $(\theta_{\hat{b}}(a)^+) - 1_{\hat{b}} <_N b$ if $N^{\{\geq \hat{b}\}}$ is of the third second type, which are both trivial.

For Axiom **MC**, we will prove the equivalence between $a < b$ and $a - b < 0$ assuming $a \in M$ and $b \in N$: the other cases are similar, or simpler. By the anti-monotonicity of minus, $a < b$ is equivalent to $-b > -a$, i.e. $-\theta_{\hat{b}}(-a)^+ <_N b$. By Axiom **MC** for N , we have $-\theta_{\hat{b}}(-a)^+ <_N b \leftrightarrow -\theta_{\hat{b}}(-a)^+ - b <_N \theta_{\hat{b}}(0)^+$, and the right side is just the expanded definition of $a - b < 0$. $\square$

4.14 Example. Let $\Lambda > -\infty$ be a cut of $W(M)$. Then, M is canonically isomorphic to $M^{\{\Lambda^L\}} \dagger_{\Theta} M^{\{\Lambda^R\}}$, where $\Theta := (S_k \upharpoonright M^{\{\Lambda^L\}})_{k > \Lambda}$.

4.4 Insemination

4.15 Definition (Insemination). Let M be a dom of the third type, P a be subgroup of $H(M)$, and $\iota : P \hookrightarrow H(M)$ be the immersion. Define the **insemination** of M at P as

$$\text{Ins}(M, P) := P \upharpoonright_{\iota} M.$$

4.16 Remark. $\text{Ins}(M, P)$ is a dom of the first type, whose underlying set is $M \sqcup P$. Moreover, M is a quasi-sub-dom of $\text{Ins}(M, P)$. Besides, for every $y \in M$ and $[x] \in P$,

$$\begin{aligned} [x] + F^+(y) &= F^+(x \upharpoonright_M y), \\ [x] + F^-(y) &= F^-(x \upharpoonright_M y), \\ [x] < y &\leftrightarrow F^+(x) \leq y, \\ [x] > y &\leftrightarrow F^-(x) \geq y. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the map $\bar{\pi} : \text{Ins}(M, P) \rightarrow M/\equiv$ sending $[x] \in P$ to itself and $y \in M$ to $[y]$ is a dom-homomorphism with kernel $\{\delta_M, 0_G, \mathbf{0}_M\}$.

4.17 Example. If G is a densely ordered group, then $\text{Ins}(\check{G}, G) = \check{G}$.

4.5 Union

4.18 Definition (Union). Let M be a dom, k be a width of M such that $k > \mathbf{0}$, and N be a super-dom of $M^{\{\geq k\}}$.¹⁸ Let $\theta_k : M^{\{< k\}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(N)$ the map sending x to $[x \upharpoonright_M k]_k$. Define

$$\uplus(M, N, k) := M^{\{< k\}} \upharpoonright_{\theta_k} N.$$

4.19 Remark. The universe of $\uplus(M, N, k)$ is $N \sqcup M^{\{< k\}} = N \cup M^{\{\leq k\}}$. Moreover, for every $x \in N$ and $y \in M^{\{< k\}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} x < y &\leftrightarrow x \leq_N y \neg_M k, \\ x > y &\leftrightarrow x \geq_N y \upharpoonright_M k, \\ x + y &:= x \upharpoonright_N (y \upharpoonright_M k). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the inclusion map from $M^{\{\leq k\}}$ to $\uplus(M, N, k)$ is a dom-homomorphism, and the inclusion map from N to $\uplus(M, N, k)$ is a quasi-dom-homomorphism.

The following remark is a special case of Example 4.14.

4.20 Remark. Let M be a dom, and $k > \mathbf{0}$ be a width of M . Then, $M = \uplus(M, M^{\{\geq k\}}, k)$.

4.6 Products

4.21 Remark. Let M be a dom of the first type, $y, y' \in M$, $x \in M^{\{0\}}$. Then, $x + y = x \upharpoonright^R y$, and $x + y \geq x + y'$ iff $y \geq y'$.

Proof. $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ means that $\hat{x} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus,

$$x + y \leq x \upharpoonright^R y \leq (x + y) \upharpoonright^R \hat{x} = (x + y) \upharpoonright^R \mathbf{0} = x + y,$$

because $\mathbf{0} = \delta$. Moreover, if $x + y = x + y'$, then $x \upharpoonright^R y - x = x \upharpoonright^R y' - x$, i.e. $y \upharpoonright^R \mathbf{0} = y' \upharpoonright^R \mathbf{0}$, thus $y = y'$. If instead $x + y < x + y'$, then obviously $y < y'$. $\square$

¹⁸Remember that this implies that the zero of N is k .

4.22 Definition (Fibered product of doms). Let N be a dom with a minimum μ_N (and a maximum $\nu_N := -\mu_N$), M be a dom of the first type, and A be a sub-dom of $M^{\{0\}}$. Define the $\mathcal{L}$ -structure $M \times_A N$ in the following way.

- The universe of $M \times_A N$ is $((M \setminus A) \times \{\mu_N\}) \sqcup (A \times N)$. It is a subset of $M \times N$.
- The order is the lexicographic one, with M more important than N : namely, $(x, y) \leq (x', y')$ iff $x < x'$ or $x = x'$ and $y \leq y'$.
- The zero is the pair $(\mathbf{0}_M, \mathbf{0}_N)$.
- The minus is defined component-wise, namely

$$-(x, y) := \begin{cases} (-x, -y) & \text{if } x \in A; \\ (-x, \mu_N) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- $(x, y) + (x', y') := (x + x', y'')$, where

$$y'' := \begin{cases} y + y' & \text{if } x + x' \in A; \\ \mu_N & \text{if } x + x' \notin A. \end{cases}$$

Define $M \times N := M \times_{M^{\{0\}}} N$. If G is a group, then $G \times N = G \times_G N$.

Note that if G is a group, then $G \times N$ is the Cartesian product of G and N , with the lexicographic order and component-wise addition and subtraction. If N is also a group, then $G \times N$ coincides with the usual product of ordered groups (with lexicographic order).

4.23 Lemma. $M \times_A N$ is a dom, of the same type as N . Moreover, $(x, y) +^R (x', y') = (x +^R x', y''')$, where

$$y''' := \begin{cases} y +^R y' & \text{if } x + x' \in A; \\ \mu_N & \text{if } x + x' \notin A. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, N can be identified naturally with a convex sub-dom of $M \times_A N$ via the map sending y to $(\mathbf{0}_M, y)$. Finally, the map $\pi_1 : M \times_A N \rightarrow M$ sending (x, y) to x is a surjective dom-homomorphism, with kernel N .

Proof. The main fact that makes the above definition work is that $y + \mu_N = y$ for every $y \in N$. Hence, if $x \notin A$ or $x' \notin A$, then $(x, y) + (x', y') = (x + x', \mu_N)$.

Associativity of sum. $(x, y) + (x', y') + (x'', y'') = (x + x' + x'', y''')$, where

$$y''' = \begin{cases} \mu_N & \text{if } x + x' + x'' \notin A; \\ y + y' + y'' & \text{if } x + x' + x'' \in A. \end{cases}$$

Axiom PA. Let $z = (x, y)$, $z' = (x', y')$, $t = (r, s)$. Since $z < z'$, then either $x < x'$, or $x = x' \in A$ and $y < y'$. If $x + r < x' + r$, we are done. Otherwise, $x + r = x' + r$. If, for contradiction, $z + t > z' + t$, then $x + r \in A$. Hence, $r \in M^{\{0\}}$, thus Remark 4.21 implies that $x = x'$. Therefore, $y + s > y' + s$, hence $y > y'$, absurd.

Axiom MA. $\delta = (\delta_M, \delta_N) \leq (\mathbf{0}_M, \mathbf{0}_N) = \mathbf{0}$.

Axiom MB. If, for contradiction, $\delta < (x, y) < \mathbf{0}$, then $\delta_M \leq x \leq \mathbf{0}_M$. However, $\delta_M = \mathbf{0}_M$, hence $x = \mathbf{0}_M$. Moreover, $\delta_N < y < \mathbf{0}_N$, absurd.

Axiom MC(b). If $(x, y) - (x, y) < \mathbf{0}$, then either $x - x < \mathbf{0}_M$ (impossible), or $x - x = \mathbf{0}_M$ and $y - y < \mathbf{0}_N$ (also impossible).

Axiom MC(a). Assume, for contradiction, that $(x, y) < (x', y')$, but $(x, y) - (x', y') \geq \mathbf{0}$. Then, either $x < x'$, and we have a contradiction, or $x = x'$ and $y < y'$. Since we have two different elements with the same abscissa x , we infer that $x \in A$, and therefore $\widehat{x} = \mathbf{0}_M$. Thus, $\mathbf{0} \leq (x, y) - (x', y') = (\mathbf{0}_M, y - y')$. Therefore, $\mathbf{0}_N \leq y - y'$, a contradiction. $\square$

Note however that the map $\pi_2 : M \times_A N \rightarrow N$ sending (x, y) to y is not a dom-homomorphism, because it does not preserve the sum. On the other hand, the map from M to $M \times_A N$ sending x to $(x, \mathbf{0}_N)$ if $x \in A$, or to (x, μ_N) otherwise, is a dom-homomorphism iff N is of the first type. Moreover, $M \times_A \mathbf{1} = M$ for any choice of A . Note also the following: if $x \in M^{\{0\}} \setminus A$, then $\widehat{(x, \mathbf{0}_N)} = (\mathbf{0}_M, \nu_N) > \mathbf{0}$. On the other hand, if $x \in A$, then $\widehat{(x, \mathbf{0}_N)} = \mathbf{0}$.

4.24 Example. Let A be a densely ordered group, and B be an ordered group. Then, $A \times B$ is naturally isomorphic to $(\tilde{A}/\equiv) \times_{H(A)} \tilde{B}$.

4.25 Definition. Let M be a dom of the first type, N be any dom, and μ be a symbol not in N . Define the $\mathcal{L}$ -structure $M \times N$ in the following way:

- The universe of $M \times N$ is $(M^{\{0\}} \times N) \sqcup (M^{>0\} \times \{\mu\})$.
- The order is the lexicographic one, with the first component more important than the second one.
- The zero is the pair $(\mathbf{0}_M, \mathbf{0}_N)$.
- The minus is defined component-wise, namely

$$-(x, y) = \begin{cases} (-x, -y) & \text{if } x \in M^{\{0\}}, \\ (-x, \mu) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- $(x, y) + (x', y') = (x + x', y'')$, where

$$y'' = \begin{cases} y + y' & \text{if } x, x' \in M^{\{0\}}, \\ \mu & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if N has a minimum $\mu = \mu_N$ the definition above coincides with the one in 4.22.

4.26 Lemma. $M \times N$ is a dom, of the same type as N . Moreover, $(x, y) \stackrel{R}{+} (x', y') = (x \stackrel{R}{+} x', y''')$, where

$$y''' := \begin{cases} y \stackrel{R}{+} y' & \text{if } x + x' \in M^{\{0\}}; \\ \mu & \text{if } x + x' \notin M^{\{0\}}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, N can be identified naturally with a convex sub-dom of $M \times N$ via the map sending y to $(\mathbf{0}_M, y)$. Finally, the map $\pi_1 : M \times_A N \rightarrow M$ sending (x, y) to x is a surjective dom-homomorphism, with kernel N .

Proof. The proof is a verbatim copy of the one of Lemma 4.23, letting $A := M^{\{0\}}$ and $\mu_N = \mu$. $\square$

Note that $M \times N$ contains a copy of N for every point of $M^{\{0\}}$.

We can combine the constructions in §§4.4 and 4.6 in the following way. Let M be as dom of the third type, and N be any dom. Consider $T := \text{Ins}(M, H(M)) \times N$. Then, T is a dom of the same type as N . It contains a copy of N inside every pair of double points of M .

4.27 Remark. Let M, A, N be as in Definition 4.22. For every $k > 0 \in W(M)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_k : M^{\{0\}} \times_A N &\rightarrow \mathcal{E}(M^{\{\geq k\}}) \\ ([a], b) &\mapsto S_k(a) = [a + k]_k. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $M \times_A N \simeq (M^{\{0\}} \times_A N) \dagger_{\Theta} N$, where $\Theta = (\theta_k)_{0 < k \in W(M)}$.

4.28 Example. The dom M^∞ defined in 3.23 is equal to $\mathbf{3} \times M$.

4.7 Collapse

4.29 Definition. Let M be a dom of the third type, and P a subgroup of $G(M)$. Hence, $M/\equiv$ is a dom of the first type, and $M/\equiv^{\{0\}} = G(M)$. Define $\text{Coll}(M, P)$ (the **collapse** of M at P) as $M/\equiv \times_P \mathbf{2}$. Define also $\pi_P : \text{Coll}(M, P) \rightarrow M/\equiv$ as the projection onto the first component.

By Lemma 4.23, π_P is a surjective dom-homomorphism, with kernel $\mathbf{2}$. On the other hand, let $\eta : M \rightarrow \text{Coll}(M, P)$ be the following map:

$$\eta(x) := \begin{cases} ([x], \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } [x] \in P \text{ and } \text{sign}(x) = 1, \\ ([x], \delta) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In general, η is *not* a dom-homomorphism, because the co-domain is a dom of the third type, and we have Remark 4.2.¹⁹ However, things are different when $P = H(M)$.

4.30 Lemma. Let M be a dom of the third type and $H := H(M)$. Then, M is isomorphic to $\text{Coll}(M, H)$, via the map η defined above.

Proof. The only difficult part is showing that $\eta(z + z') = \eta(z) + \eta(z')$ for every $z, z' \in M$. Assume not. Since $[z] = \pi_H(\eta z)$, and π_H is a dom-homomorphism, we must have $z + z' \in D(M)$, and $\text{sign}(\eta(z + z'))$ different from $\text{sign}(\eta z + \eta z')$. However, by definition of η , for every $x \in D(M)$, $\text{sign}(x) = \text{sign}(\eta x)$. Hence, we must also have z and z' not in $D(M)$. But then $z + z'$ and $\eta(z) + \eta(z')$ have both signature -1 , and we are done. $\square$

4.8 Dedekind cuts

We will now study $\check{M}$, the set of cuts of a dom M . As before, we will need M to be of the first type. The order and the minus are the obvious ones. On the other hand, we have 4 candidates for the plus, all of them making $\check{M}$ an ordered monoid. However, only one of them makes $\check{M}$ a dom.

¹⁹For instance, take $M = \check{\mathbb{Q}}$, $P = \mathbb{Z}$, $x = 1/2^-$, $x' = y = 1/2^+$. Then, x and x' have the same image, but $x + y = 1^-$ and $x' + y = 1^+$ have different images.

4.31 Definition. Given a pre-dom M , let $\check{M}$ be the set of Dedekind cuts of M . Endow $\check{M}$ with a $\mathcal{L}$ -structure, using the following rules: for every $\Lambda = (\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$ and $\Gamma = (\Gamma^L, \Gamma^R)$ in $\check{M}$

Order: $\Lambda \leq \Gamma$ if $\Lambda^L \subseteq \Gamma^L$ iff $\Lambda^R \supseteq \Gamma^R$.

Minus: $-\Lambda := (-\Lambda^R, -\Lambda^L)$.

Zero: $\mathbf{0} := \mathbf{0}_M^+ = ((-\infty, \mathbf{0}_M], (\mathbf{0}_M, +\infty))$.

Plus: $\Lambda + \Gamma := (\Lambda^L \dot{+}^R \Gamma^L)^+$.

Moreover, given $x \in M$, define $x + \Lambda := (x \dot{+}^R \Lambda^L)^+$.²⁰ Finally, $x < \Lambda$ if $x \in \Lambda^L$, and $x > \Lambda$ if $x \in \Lambda^R$.

4.32 Remark. If M is a pre-dom, then $\check{M}$ is also a pre-dom. Moreover, $\Lambda \dot{+}^R \Gamma = (\Lambda^R + \Gamma^R)^-$, and $\Lambda - \Gamma = (\Lambda^R \dot{-} \Gamma^L)^-$.

Proof. It is enough to prove that $\Lambda + \mathbf{0} = \Lambda$ and Axiom **PA**. In fact, $\Lambda + \mathbf{0} = (\Lambda^L \dot{+}^R \mathbf{0}_M)^+ = (\Lambda^L)^+ = \Lambda$. Moreover, if for contradiction $\Lambda < \Lambda'$, but $\Lambda + \Gamma > \theta > \Lambda' + \Gamma$, then $\theta \leq \lambda \dot{+}^R \gamma$ for some $\lambda < \Lambda$, $\gamma < \Gamma$. Therefore, $\lambda < \Lambda'$, thus $\theta < \Lambda' + \Gamma$, absurd. $\square$

By Remark 1.1, $\check{M}$ is complete, and hence compact in its interval topology.

4.33 Proposition. If M is a dom of the first type, then $\check{M}$ is also a dom, satisfying $\delta = \mathbf{0}_M^- < \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. Axioms **MA** and **MB** are trivial.

MC(b). If $\Lambda - \Gamma < \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{0} \geq \lambda \dot{-} \gamma$ for some $\lambda > \Lambda$, $\gamma < \Gamma$. Since $\mathbf{0}_M = \delta_M$, we infer that $\lambda \leq \gamma$, and therefore $\Lambda < \Gamma$.

MC(a). If $\Lambda < \Gamma$, then there exists $x \in M$ such that $\Lambda < x < \Gamma$. Therefore, $\mathbf{0}_M \geq x \dot{-} x > \Lambda - \Gamma$, hence $\mathbf{0} > \Lambda - \Gamma$. $\square$

4.34 Remark. Let M be a dom of the first type, and $a \in M$; then $\widehat{a^+} \geq (\widehat{a})^-$ and $\widehat{a^-} \geq (\widehat{a})^+$.

Proof. By Remark 4.32, $\widehat{a^+} = \{x - a : a < x\}^-$, and the conclusion follows. The other inequality is similar. $\square$

Hence, we might have a discontinuity of the function $\mu(x) := a - x$ at the point $x = a$. More precisely, $\mu(a) = \widehat{a} \geq \mathbf{0}$, while

$$\{\mu(x) : x > a\}^+ = \{a \dot{+}^R x' : x' < -a\}^+ = a^+ + (-a)^- = -(\widehat{a^+}) \leq (-\widehat{a})^+.$$

Therefore, if $\widehat{a}$ is sufficiently large (more precisely, if there exists $y \in M$ such that $\mathbf{0} < \widehat{y} < \widehat{a}$), we can have $(-\widehat{a})^+ < \mathbf{0}^-$.

In this case, let $(-\widehat{a})^+ < z < \widehat{a}$, and $\Lambda := (-x)^-$. Hence, $a \dot{+}^R x < z < \widehat{a}$ for every $x < -a$, i.e. $a \dot{+}^R \Lambda^L < z < a \dot{+}^R \Lambda^R$. Therefore, $(a \dot{+}^R \Lambda^L, a \dot{+}^R \Lambda^R)$ is not a cut.

²⁰ $(x \dot{+}^R \Lambda^L, x \dot{+}^R \Lambda^R)$ is not a cut in general.

Examples. 4.35. We left open the question of what happens if we choose a different definition of plus for $\tilde{M}$. If we want $\delta \leq 0$, the only other possible definition of plus is $\Lambda \dot{+} \Gamma := (\Lambda^L + \Gamma^L)^+$. If M is a pre-dom, then $\tilde{M}$, with this modified plus, is also a pre-dom. However, if M is a dom of the first type, then $\tilde{M}$ will satisfy axioms **MA**, **MB** and **MC(b)**, but not **MC(a)**. For instance, take $x \in M$ such that $\hat{x} > 0_M$, and let $\Lambda = x^-$, $\Gamma = x^+$. Then, $\Lambda - \Gamma = (\hat{x})^- \geq 0$, even though $\Lambda < \Gamma$.

4.36. Let G be an ordered group. Therefore, G is a dom of the first type. The definition of $\tilde{G}$ in §2 and the one given above coincide.

4.9 Shift

4.37 Definition. Assume that M is a dom of the second type. Define $\dot{x} := 0_M \neg_M x$. The **shift** of M is the structure $M^s := (M, \leq_M, 0_M, +_M, \dot{x})$.

4.38 Definition. Assume that M is a dom of the first type, with a minimal positive element 1, such that $1 \neg_M 1 = 0_M$. Define $\dot{x} := 1 \neg_M x$. The **shift** of M is the structure $M^s := (M, \leq_M, 0_M, +_M, \dot{x})$.

If M is of the third type, the shift of M is M itself.

4.39 Lemma. If M is a dom of the second type, then M^s is a dom of the first type, satisfying the condition of Definition 4.38. If M is a dom satisfying the condition of Definition 4.38, then M^s is a dom of the second type. In both cases, $x \dot{x} y = x \neg_M y$ and $M^{ss} = M$. Moreover, $\dot{x} = \neg_M x$ for every $x \in M^{\{>0\}}$.

Proof. The conclusion is an immediate consequence of the facts that $\dot{x}$ is an anti-automorphism of $(M^s, \dot{x})$, that $\dot{x}(\dot{x}x) = x$, and that $x \dot{x} y = x \neg_M y$, which are left as an exercise. $\square$

4.40 Example. Let H be a discretely ordered group, 1 be its minimal positive element, and $M := \tilde{H}^{\{0\}}$. Then, $M = H^s$ and $H = M^s$.

Examples. Let B be a densely ordered group, A be a subgroup of B , and M be a dom, with a maximum ν_M . Note that $\tilde{B}$ is a dom of the third type, and that $B = H(\tilde{B})$. Call $\theta : A \hookrightarrow H(\tilde{B})$ the inclusion map.

4.41. $\text{Ins}(\tilde{B}, A) = A \dot{+}_\theta \tilde{B}$ is the sub-dom of $\tilde{B}$ given by $A \sqcup \tilde{B}$.

4.42. $B \times_A M$ is the dom (of the same type as M), constructed in this way: starting from B , substitute every point of A with a copy of M . If $b \in B \setminus A$, then $\hat{b} = (0, \nu_M)$ inside $B \times_A M$.

4.43. $\text{Coll}(\tilde{B}, A)$ is the dom (of the third type) constructed in this way: starting from $\tilde{B}$, identify b^+ with b^- , for every $b \in B \setminus A$.

In the following section we will apply most of the constructions showed in this one.

5 Embedding doms in cuts of groups

The aim of this section is proving that every dom M can be embedded in a dom of the form either $\tilde{G}$ or $\check{G}$, for some ordered (Abelian) group G . We will deal first with proper doms, and then prove the general case.

5.1 Proper doms of the first and second type

Any ordered group H is, by definition, a subgroup of $\tilde{H}^{\{0\}} = \{x \in \tilde{H} : \hat{x} = \mathbf{0}\}$; it is trivial to see that it is actually equal to $\tilde{H}^{\{0\}}$. Let $\tau : H \rightarrow \tilde{H}^{\{0\}}$ be the natural dom-isomorphism.

Consider the map $\tilde{\iota}$ from H to $G(\tilde{H})$, obtained by composing the embedding of H in $\tilde{H}$ with the quotient map π from $\tilde{H}^{\{0\}}$ to $G(\tilde{H})$. It is easy to see that $\tilde{\iota}$ is an isomorphism of ordered groups, and hence we can identify canonically H with $G(\tilde{H})$.

There exists also a map $\tilde{\iota}$ from H to $G(\tilde{H})$, the composition of the map from H in $\tilde{H}$ sending x to x^+ with the quotient map π from $\tilde{H}^{\{0\}}$ to $G(\tilde{H})$. It is easy to see that $\tilde{\iota}$ is an injective homomorphism of ordered groups, and hence we can also identify canonically H with a subgroup of $G(\tilde{H})$. In general, $\tilde{\iota}$ is not surjective. For instance, $G(\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}) = \mathbb{R}$.

If H is *discrete* and non-trivial, let 1 be its minimal positive element. In this case, we must pay attention to the fact that the minus $-$ of $G(\tilde{H})$ induced by the quotient map π is not the group minus (let us call it $\cdot^*$), but instead $-x + 1 = \cdot^*x$. Hence, in that case, if we want $\tilde{\iota}$ to be a dom-homomorphism, we must either substitute $\cdot^*$ to the minus on $G(\tilde{H})$, or $-x + 1$ to the minus on H .

If instead H is *densely ordered*, $\tilde{\iota}$ is a dom-homomorphism. Moreover, the group $G(\tilde{H})$ coincides with the completion of H via Cauchy sequences; cf. [4, § V.11] (see also [12] for the completion of ordered fields).

In general, the image of $M^{\{0\}}$ in $M/\equiv$ under the quotient map π is exactly $G(M)$.

Besides, if $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a dom-homomorphism, then $f(M^{\{0\}}) \subseteq N^{\{0\}}$.

1 Theorem. *Let M be a proper dom, and $G := G(M)$ the group associated to M . If M is of the first or second type, then there exists a unique homomorphism of ordered monoids $\tilde{\psi} : M \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ such that the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M^{\{0\}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}^0} & \tilde{G}^{\{0\}} \\
 \pi^0 \downarrow & \nearrow \tau & \\
 G & &
 \end{array} \tag{5.1}$$

If M is of the second type, then there exists a unique dom-homomorphism $\tilde{\psi} : M \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M^{\{0\}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}^0} & \tilde{G}^{\{0\}} \\
 \pi^0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi^0 \\
 G & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\iota}} & G(\tilde{G})
 \end{array} \tag{5.2}$$

Moreover, $\tilde{\psi}$ and $\tilde{\iota}$ are injective, and if M is of the first type, then $\tilde{\psi}$ is actually a dom-homomorphism.

In the diagrams above, $\tilde{\psi}^0$ (resp. $\tilde{\psi}^0$) is the restriction of $\tilde{\psi}$ (resp. $\tilde{\psi}$) to $M^{\{0\}}$; besides, the maps denoted by π^0 , which are the restrictions of the quotient maps, are dom-homomorphisms; the map $\tilde{\iota}$ becomes a dom-homomorphism if the structure of G or $G(\tilde{G})$ is modified as described above.

Proof. Let $x \in M^{\{>0\}} := M \setminus M^{\{0\}}$. For such x , $\tilde{\psi}(x)$ and $\tilde{\psi}(x)$ must coincide, and be equal to $\Lambda(x)$ (cf. 3.50).

It remains to show the existence and uniqueness of the extensions of Λ to M in the various cases. Let $x \in M^{\{0\}}$: we have to define the image of x .

In the case when M is of the first or second type, π^0 is an isomorphism of ordered groups. The only possible way to extend Λ to $\tilde{\psi}$ is by defining $\tilde{\psi}(x) := \pi(x) = [x]$. It is now trivial to see that $\tilde{\psi}$ is an injective homomorphism of ordered monoids. Moreover, when M is of the first type, the group-minus and the dom-minus on G coincide; therefore, in that case $\tilde{\psi}$ is a dom-homomorphism, too.

Since $\tilde{\psi}$ is a dom-homomorphism, $\tilde{\psi}(0) = 0^+$. Moreover, if M is of the first or second type, the quotient map π is injective, hence the only value for $\tilde{\psi}$ that makes the Diagram 5.2 commute is x^+ .

It is now easy to see that $\tilde{\psi}$ so defined is indeed an injective dom-homomorphism. $\square$

5.1 Example. Let $M := \mathbb{Q} \times_{\{0\}} \mathbf{2}$. That is, M is the dom of the third type obtained from $\mathbb{Q}$ by duplicating the element 0. Note that M is strongly proper, because, for every $x \in M$, $\hat{x} = \mathbf{0}$. However, if $G = G(M) = \mathbb{Q}$, M cannot be embedded in $\tilde{G}$ or $\check{G}$ in a way that makes the diagrams 5.1 or 5.2 commute.²¹

5.2 Proper doms of the third type

Given a proper dom of the third type M , we want to construct a densely ordered group G , and an embedding of M into $\tilde{G}$. To see where a difficulty of the task lies, and to get an idea of how we proceed in solving it, the reader can try his hand at the following exercise.

5.2 Exercise. Let $M := \mathbb{R} \times_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{2}$. That is, start from the group $\mathbb{R}$, and obtain M by duplicating all the natural numbers. Note that M is a proper dom of the third type. Find an embedding of M into some $\tilde{G}$.

5.3 Lemma. Let K be an ordered group, and A, B and C be subgroups of K , such that $A \cap B = C$, and for every $0 < \varepsilon \in K$ and $a \in A$ there exist b and $b' \in B$ such that

$$a - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < b < a < b' < a + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then, if H is any ordered group, there exists an injective dom-homomorphism $\psi : A \times_C \tilde{H} \rightarrow B \times H$.

We should interpret the inequality $a - \varepsilon/2 < b$ as either taking place in the divisible hull of K , or as a shorthand for $2(a - b) < \varepsilon$.

Proof. To simplify the notation, we will use letters $a, a', \dots$ for elements of A ; $b, b', \dots$ for elements of B ; $c, c', \dots$ for elements of C ; and $h, h', \dots$ for elements of H .

Claim 1. For every $a < a' \in A$ there exists $b \in B$ such that $a < b < a'$.

²¹However, if we do not insist on the corresponding diagram to commute, we can define an embedding of M into $\check{\mathbb{Q}}$, by sending 1 into π (or any irrational positive element).

Apply the hypothesis with $\varepsilon := a' - a$.

Define a map $\theta^- : A \rightarrow \tilde{B}$ sending a to $\{b \in B : b < a\}^+$.

Claim 2. θ^- is injective and preserves the sum and the order (but not the minus).

In fact, Claim 1 implies immediately that if $a < a'$, then $\theta^-(a) < \theta^-(a')$, hence θ^- is injective and preserves the order. Moreover,

$$\theta^-(a) + \theta^-(a') = \{b \in B : b < a\}^+ + \{b' \in B : b' < a'\}^+ \leq \theta^-(a + a').$$

If, for contradiction, $\theta^-(a) + \theta^-(a') < b'' < \theta^-(a + a')$, then $b'' < a + a'$ and $b'' > b + b'$ for every b and $b' \in B$ such that $b < a$ and $b' < a'$. Let $\varepsilon := a + a' - b'' > 0$, and $b, b' \in B$ such that $a - \varepsilon/2 < b < a$ and $a' - \varepsilon/2 < b' < a'$. Then, $b'' = a + a' - \varepsilon < b + b'$, absurd.

For every $a \in A$ and $\Lambda \in \check{H}$, define

$$\psi(a, \Lambda) := \{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) < (a, \Lambda)\}^+,$$

where the $<$ is the lexicographic order on $K \times \tilde{H}$. We have to prove that ψ is indeed an injective dom-homomorphism.

Claim 3. $\psi(a, \Lambda)$ is the cut

$$\left(\{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) < (a, \Lambda)\}, \{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) > (a, \Lambda)\} \right).$$

Assume, for contradiction, that there exists $(b, h) \in B \times H$ such that $(b', h') < (b, h) < (b'', h'')$ for every $(b', h') < (a, \Lambda)$ and $(b'', h'') > (a, \Lambda)$. Fix $0 < \varepsilon \in K$, and let $b', b'' \in B$ such that $a - \varepsilon/2 < b' < a < b'' < a + \varepsilon/2$. Hence, $b' \leq b \leq b''$, thus $|a - b| < \varepsilon$. We conclude that $a = b \in C$. Hence, $\Lambda < h < \Lambda$, absurd.

Let μ be the minimum of $\check{H}$. Therefore, if $a \in C$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(-(a, \Lambda)) &= \\ &= \left(\{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) < (-a, -\Lambda)\}, \{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) > (-a, -\Lambda)\} \right) = \\ &= - \left(\{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) < (a, \Lambda)\}, \{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) > (a, \Lambda)\} \right) = \\ &= -\psi(a, \Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

If instead $a \notin C$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(-(a, \mu)) &= \psi(-a, \mu) = \\ &= \left(\{(b, h) \in B \times H : b < -a\}, \{(b, h) \in B \times H : b > -a\} \right) = -\psi(a, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, ψ preserves the minus.

Moreover, if $(a, \Lambda) < (a', \Lambda')$, then either $a < a'$, or $a = a' \in C$ and $\Lambda < \Lambda'$. In the first case, let $b \in B$ such that $a < b < a'$. Hence, $\psi(a, \Lambda) < (b, h) < \psi(a', \Lambda')$ for every $h \in H$. In the second case, let $h \in H$ such that $\Lambda < h < \Lambda'$. Hence, $\psi(a, \Lambda) < (a, h) < \psi(a', \Lambda')$. Therefore, we conclude that ψ is injective and preserves the order.

Moreover, ψ preserves the zero, because

$$\psi(0, 0^+) = \{(b, h) \in B \times H : (b, h) \leq (0, 0)\}^+ = (0, 0)^+.$$

Claim 4. For every $a \in A$ and $c \in C$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{b + c : b < a\}^+ &= \theta^-(a + c) = \\ &= \theta^-(a) + \theta^-(c) = \{b \in B : b < a\}^+ + \{b' \in B : b' < c\}^+. \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to prove the first equality: the others follow from the definition of θ^- and Claim 2. The fact that the left hand side is less or equal to the right hand side is trivial. Assume for contradiction that $\{b + c : b < a\}^+ < b'' < \{b' \in B : b' < a + c\}^+$ for some $b'' \in B$. Hence, for every $b \in B$ such that $b < a$, we have $b + c < b'' < a + c$, i.e. $b < b'' - c < a$. But $b'' - c$ is in B , and we have an absurd.

It remains to show that ψ preserves the sum, namely $\psi(a, \Lambda) + \psi(a', \Lambda') = \psi((a, \Lambda) + (a', \Lambda'))$. We will make a case distinction.

- If $\Lambda = \mu$, while $\Lambda' > \mu$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(a, \mu) + \psi(a', \Lambda') &= \{(b + b', h + h') : b < a \text{ \& } (b', h') < (a', \Lambda')\}^+ = \\ &= \{(b + a', h + h') : b < a \text{ \& } h' < \Lambda'\}^+ = \{(b + a', h) : b < a\}^+. \end{aligned}$$

By Claim 4, the latter is equal to

$$\{(b'', h) : b'' < a + a'\}^+ = \psi(a + a', \mu) = \psi((a, \mu) + (a', \Lambda')).$$

- If $\Lambda = \mu = \Lambda'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(a, \mu) + \psi(a', \mu) &= \\ &= \{(b, h) \in B \times H : b < a\}^+ + \{(b', h') \in B \times H : b' < a'\}^+ = \\ &= \{(b + b', h'') \in B \times H : b < a \text{ \& } b' < a'\}^+. \end{aligned}$$

By Claim 2, the latter is equal to

$$\{(b'', h'') \in B \times H : b'' < a + a'\}^+ = \psi(a + a', \mu) = \psi((a, \mu) + (a', \mu)).$$

- If $a, a' \in C$, and $\Lambda, \Lambda' > \mu$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(a, \Lambda) + \psi(a', \Lambda') &= \{(a, h) + (a', h') : h < \Lambda \text{ \& } h' < \Lambda'\}^+ = \\ &= \{(a + a', h'') : h'' < \Lambda + \Lambda'\}^+ = \psi(a + a', \Lambda + \Lambda'). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Let A be any ordered group and C be a subgroup of A . Let $\mathbb{Q}[\varepsilon]$ be the ring generated by $\mathbb{Q}$ and a positive infinitesimal element ε . Let $K := \mathbb{Q}[\varepsilon] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A$, with the ordering given by $a \gg \varepsilon \gg \varepsilon^2 \dots$ for every $0 < a \in A$. Let B be the following subgroup of K :

$$B := C + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} A(1 + (-\varepsilon)^n) = C + A(1 - \varepsilon) + A(1 + \varepsilon^2) + \dots$$

If we identify A with the subgroup $A \cdot 1$ of K , we have that A, B, C , and K satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 5.3. In fact, $A \cap B = C$. Moreover, if ε^{2n} is a small positive element of K (for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$), and $a \in A$, then $a(1 - \varepsilon^{2n+1})$ and $a(1 + \varepsilon^{2n+2})$ are both in B .

Hence, for any ordered group H , we can embed $A \times_C \check{H}$ into $\widetilde{B \times H}$. Let M be a proper dom of the third type, $A := G(M)$, and $C := H(M)$. Choose B and K such that A, B, C and K satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 5.3 (for instance, $K := \mathbb{Q}[\varepsilon] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A$ and $B := C + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} A(1 + (-\varepsilon)^n)$ as in the construction above). Therefore, if we choose $H := \{0\}$, then we can embed $A \times_C 2$ into $\widetilde{B \times \{0\}} = \check{B}$. Moreover, $A \times_C 2$ is canonically isomorphic to $M^{\{0\}}$, hence we can embed $M^{\{0\}}$ into $\check{B}$ via a map ψ_0 .

The next step is defining an embedding $\psi_{>0}$ of $M^{\{>0\}}$ in $\check{B}$, where $B = B(M)$ is the group constructed above. Let $\sigma : B \rightarrow A$ be the map sending $\sum_{i < N} a_i \varepsilon^i$ to a_0 . Obviously, σ is a surjective homomorphism of ordered groups, hence, by Remark 3.26, it induces an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism $\check{\sigma} : \check{A} \rightarrow \check{B}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.51, there is an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism $\Lambda : M^{\{>0\}} \rightarrow \check{A}$. Define $\psi_{>0} : M^{\{>0\}} \rightarrow \check{B}$ as $\check{\sigma} \circ \Lambda$. Hence, $\psi_{>0}$ is also an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism.

Define $\check{\psi} : M \rightarrow \check{B}$ as

$$\check{\psi}(x) = \begin{cases} \psi_0(x) & \text{if } x \in M^{\{0\}}, \\ \psi_{>0}(x) & \text{if } x \in M^{\{>0\}}. \end{cases}$$

The final step is proving that $\check{\psi}$ is indeed an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism. We will need that M is *strongly proper* (and not simply proper) to do that. Note that, for every $x \in M^{\{0\}}$,

$$\psi_0(x) = \begin{cases} \{b \in B : b < [x]\}^+ & \text{if } x = F^-(x), \\ [x]^+ & \text{if } [x] \in C \text{ \& } x = F^+(x), \end{cases}$$

or equivalently

$$\psi_0(x) = \begin{cases} \{b \in B : b < [x]\}^+ = \{b \in B : b > [x]\}^- & \text{if } [x] \in A \setminus C, \\ [x]^- & \text{if } [x] \in C \text{ \& } x = F^-(x), \\ [x]^+ & \text{if } [x] \in C \text{ \& } x = F^+(x). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $y \in M^{\{>0\}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{>0}(y) &= \{b \in B : \sigma(b) < y\}^+ = \{b \in B : \sigma(b) > y\}^- = \\ &= \{[x_0] + [x_1]\varepsilon + \dots + [x_N]\varepsilon^N \in B : x_0 < y\}^+. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\check{\psi}$ preserves the minus, because that is true for both $\psi_{>0}$ and ψ_0 .

We will now prove that $\check{\psi}$ is injective. This is a consequence of the following claim.

5.4 Claim. For every $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ and $y \in M^{\{>0\}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x) &\in \check{B}^{\{0\}}, \\ \psi_{>0}(y) &\in \check{B}^{\{>0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{x} = 0^+$, $\widehat{\psi_0(x)} = \psi_0(\hat{x}) = \psi_0(0^+) = 0^+$. Since $\hat{y} > 0^+$ and M is strongly proper, there exists $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $0 < x < \hat{y}$. Let $b := [x](1 + \varepsilon^2) \in B$. Then, $\sigma(b) = [x] < [\hat{y}]$, hence $\widehat{\psi_{>0}(y)} = \psi_{>0}(\hat{y}) > b > 0^+$.

We will now prove that $\check{\psi}$ preserves the order. It suffices to prove that for every $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ and $y \in M^{\{>0\}}$, if $x < y$, then $\psi_0(x) < \psi_{>0}(y)$ (the other possibility $x > y$ is proved in a similar way). Let $b := [x](1 + \varepsilon^2) \in B$. Then, $\sigma(b) = [x] < y$, hence $b < \psi_{>0}(y)$. Moreover, $b > [x]$, thus $b > \psi_0(x)$. Therefore, $\psi_0(x) < b < \psi_{>0}(y)$.

Finally, we have to prove that $\check{\psi}$ preserves the sum. It suffices to prove that, for every $x \in M^{\{0\}}$ and $y \in M^{\{>0\}}$,

$$\psi_0(x) + \psi_{>0}(y) = \psi_{>0}(x+y).$$

First, note that

$$\{b \in B : \sigma(b) < [x]\}^+ < \psi_0(x) \leq \{b \in B : \sigma(b) \leq [x]\}^+.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x) + \psi_{>0}(y) &\leq \{b + b' : \sigma(b) \leq [x] \text{ \& } \sigma(b') < [y]\}^+ \leq \\ &\leq \{b'' \in B : \sigma(b'') \leq [x+y]\}^+ = \psi_{>0}(x+y). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $[x](1 - \varepsilon^{2k+1}) < \psi_0(x) < [x](1 + \varepsilon^{2k})$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Assume, for contradiction, that there exists $b'' \in B$ such that $\psi_0(x) + \psi_{>0}(y) < b'' < \psi_{>0}(x+y)$. Let $\gamma := \sigma(b'') \in A$. Then, $\gamma < [x+y]$. Let $\lambda := \gamma - [x] \in A$. Hence, $\lambda + [x] = \gamma < [x] + [y]$, thus $\lambda < [x]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(1 + \varepsilon^2) &< \psi_{>0}(y), \\ [x](1 - \varepsilon^3) &< \psi_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\gamma > \lambda(1 + \varepsilon^2) + [x](1 - \varepsilon^3) = (\lambda + [x]) + \lambda\varepsilon^2 - [x]\varepsilon^3 > \lambda + [x] = \gamma,$$

absurd. Therefore, we have proved the following lemma.

5.5 Lemma. *Let M a strongly proper dom of the third type. Then, if $B = B(M)$ is the group constructed above, M can be embedded in $\check{B}$.*

What happens if M is a dom of the third type, which is proper, but not strongly proper (for instance, $M = \mathbf{4}$)? Then, first we embed M in a strongly proper dom of the same type M' , and then we apply the above lemma to embed M' in $\check{B}$ for a suitable ordered group B . More precisely, let M a proper dom of the third type. Let $N := M/\equiv \times \mathbb{R}$; note that N is a dom of the first type, and that $M/\equiv$ is a sub-dom of N , via the map sending y to $(y, 0)$ if $y \in M^{\{0\}}$, and to (y, μ) otherwise. Define $M' := N \times_{M/\equiv} \mathbf{2}$.

5.6 Lemma. *The above defined M' is a strongly proper dom of the third type. Moreover, the map $\xi : M \rightarrow M'$ defined by*

$$\xi(x) = \begin{cases} ([x], \mu, \delta) & \text{if } x \in M^{\{>0\}}, \\ ([x], 0, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } x \in M^{\{0\}} \text{ \& } \text{sign}(x) = 1, \\ ([x], 0, \delta) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is a dom-homomorphism.

Note that we could have used any non-trivial ordered group instead of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Trivial verifications, using Lemma 4.26. □

Hence, we have proved the following lemma:

5.7 Lemma. *Let M a proper dom of the third type. Then, M can be embedded in $\check{B}$ for some densely ordered group B .*

5.3 Abelian extensions of groups

The definitions and facts in this subsection can be found in any book on homological algebra, and will be used in the next subsection. We will use [5, Ch. 9] as a reference on extensions of groups.²² The reader can also consult [9].

5.8 Definition (Factor sets). Let A and C be (Abelian) groups. A **factor set** is a map $f : C \times C \rightarrow A$ such that, for every $x, y, z \in C$,

- $f(x, y) = f(y, x)$;
- $f(x, 0) = f(0, x) = f(0, 0) = 0$;
- $f(y, x) + f(x, y + z) = f(x, y) + f(x + y, z)$.

Given such a factor set, the **crossed product** of C and A is the group $\times(C, A, f)$, whose underlying set is $C \times A$, and whose sum is defined as follows:

$$(c, a) + (c', a') = (c + c', a + a' + f(c, c')).$$

The reader can verify that $\times(C, A, f)$ is indeed an Abelian group, with neutral element $(0, 0)$. Moreover, the maps $\iota : A \rightarrow \times(C, A, f)$ sending a to $(0, a)$ and $\pi : \times(C, A, f) \rightarrow C$ sending (c, a) to c are group-homomorphisms. Finally, the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\iota} \times(C, A, f) \xrightarrow{\pi} C \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

Conversely, given any exact sequence of groups

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\iota'} B \xrightarrow{\pi'} C \longrightarrow 0, \quad (E)$$

a **section** is a map $s : C \rightarrow B$ that fixes 0 and is a right inverse of π' : i.e., $s(0) = 0$ and for every $c \in C$, $\pi'(s(c)) = c$. Given such a section s , the differential of s is the factor set ds defined as follows: $ds(x, y) = ds(x) + ds(y) - ds(x + y)$. One can verify that ds is indeed a factor set, and that the map $\beta : B \rightarrow \times(C, A, ds)$ sending b to $(\pi'(b), b - s(\pi'(b)))$ is an isomorphism of groups, such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & C \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \beta & & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \times(C, A, ds) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & C \end{array}$$

Hence, given an exact sequence (E), w.l.o.g. we can assume that $B = \times(C, A, f)$ for some factor set f .

We will need the following proposition ([5, Proposition 24.6] and [9, Corollary III.3.8]).

²²We recall that for us all groups are Abelian.

5.9 Proposition. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of groups, and $\gamma: C \rightarrow C'$ be an injective homomorphism of groups. Then, there exist an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{i'} B' \xrightarrow{\pi'} C' \rightarrow 0$ and an injective group-homomorphism $\beta: B \rightarrow B'$ such that the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi} & C \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \gamma \\
 A & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & C'
 \end{array}$$

By the above considerations, we can assume that B' is of the form $\times(C', A, f)$ for some factor set f .

Assume now that A and C are ordered groups, B is a group, and that we have an exact sequence (E). Then, there exists a unique ordering on B such that all maps in (E) are homomorphism of ordered groups. The ordering is defined by: $b \leq b'$ iff $\pi(b) < \pi(b')$ or $\pi(b) = \pi(b')$ and $b - b' \leq 0$ (in A). In particular, on $\times(C, A, f)$ the ordering is the lexicographic one. Moreover, with the ordering defined above, A is a convex subgroup of B .

Moreover, in the situation of Proposition 5.9, if C' is an ordered group, and $\gamma: C \rightarrow C'$ is also a homomorphism of ordered groups, then $\beta: B \rightarrow B'$ is also a homomorphism of ordered groups, where B and B' are endowed with the above defined orderings. Hence, we have proved the following:

5.10 Corollary. *Let $\theta: B \rightarrow D$ be a homomorphism of ordered groups. Then, B can be embedded in the crossed product $\times(D, \ker \theta, f)$ for some factor set f , where $\times(D, \ker \theta, f)$ is endowed with the lexicographic ordering. Namely, the following diagram of ordered groups with exact rows commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker(\theta) & \longrightarrow & B & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Im}(\theta) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow \beta & \searrow \theta & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker(\theta) & \xrightarrow{i} & \times(D, \ker \theta, f) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & D \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

5.4 General case

In this subsection we will drop the “properness” hypothesis.

5.11 Proposition. *Let T be any first-order theory, and S be a universal theory (i.e. axiomatised by a set of universal formulae) in the same language L , such that $T_{\forall} \vdash S$ (where $T_{\forall}$ denotes the universal part of T). In this case, the following are equivalent:*

1. $T_{\forall} = S$;
2. every model of S is a substructure of some model of T ;

3. every finitely generated model of S is a substructure of some model of T .

Suppose moreover that any of the above equivalent conditions is satisfied, and that $\mathfrak{C}$ is a class of L -structures, such that every model of T can be embedded in some structure in $\mathfrak{C}$. Then,

1. every model of S can be embedded in some structure in $\mathfrak{C}$;
2. S is the universal part of the theory of the structures in $\mathfrak{C}$.

Proof. Easy. □

5.12 Lemma. *Let M be a dom: if $W(M)$ has a least non zero element ∞ , and $M^{\{\geq \infty\}}$ is proper, then M is isomorphic to a sub-dom of some proper dom T .*

Claim 1. It is sufficient to prove the Lemma when M is of the first type, provided that if M has a least positive element 1, then the constructed N has a least positive element too, and 1 is mapped to it.

Proof of Claim 1. If M is of the first type then nothing should be proved.

If M is of the second type then consider a proper dom N s.t. M^s is isomorphic to a sub-dom of it. Then we claim: M is isomorphic to a sub-dom of N^s , which is trivial because of our assumption on the least elements, and N^s is proper, which is trivial because $a -_N a = 0$ iff $a \leq_N a = 0$.

If M is of the third type then consider a proper dom N s.t. $M/\equiv$ is isomorphic to a sub-dom of it. Then we claim: M is isomorphic to a sub-dom of $N \times_G \mathbf{2}$, where G is the isomorphic image of $H(M)$, which is trivial because M is isomorphic to $M/\equiv \times_{H(M)} \mathbf{2}$, and $N \times_G \mathbf{2}$ is proper, which is trivial because $a - a$ is 0 in the product iff the first component is. □

Claim 2. It is sufficient to prove the Lemma when either $\mathcal{E}(M^{\{\infty\}})$ is the whole $M^{\{\geq \infty\}}/\equiv$ or it is dense in it.

Proof of Claim 2. If $M^{\{\geq \infty\}}$ is of the second type nothing should be proved. Otherwise, by Lemma 5.7, $M^{\{\geq \infty\}}$ is a sub-dom of $\check{G}$ for some densely ordered group G , and by §4.5 M may be embedded in the dom $M^{\{0\}} \sqcup \check{G}$ (with appropriate definitions for operations and order). Now, by a general fact, if G is dense, then $H(\check{G})$ is dense in $\check{G}/\equiv$. □

Proof of Lemma 5.12. We give an explicit construction of a dom N s.t. M is a sub-dom of N , under the additional hypothesis stated in claims 1 and 2.

Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker(\rho) \rightarrow M^{\{0\}} \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathcal{E}(M^{\{\geq \infty\}})$$

where ρ is the function defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : M^{\{0\}} &\rightarrow \mathcal{E}(M^{\{\geq \infty\}}) \\ x &\mapsto [x + \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 5.10 the group $M^{\{0\}}$ (which is a group because of Claim 1) can be embedded in a crossed product $\Pi = \times(\mathcal{E}(M^{\{\geq \infty\}}), \ker(\rho), f)$ for an appropriate choice of f . We know that the function

$$\begin{aligned} \rho' : \Pi &\rightarrow \mathcal{E}(M^{\{\geq \infty\}}) \\ (x, y) &\mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

consistently extends ρ , therefore, in the following, $M^{\{0\}}$ will be identified with a sub-group of Π and ρ will be identified with the restriction of ρ' to $M^{\{0\}}$.

We claim that the structure $N := \Pi \upharpoonright_{\theta_\infty} M^{\{\geq \infty\}}$, where $\theta_\infty(x) = [\rho(x) + \infty]_\infty$, is a super-dom of M (which is trivial because $M = M^{\{< \infty\}} \upharpoonright_{\theta_\infty} M^{\{\geq \infty\}} < N$), and moreover it is proper and it verifies the hypothesis of Claim 2.

The only non-trivial point arises in proving the properness of N when $M^{\{\geq \infty\}}$ is of the third type. In that case we need the density of $\mathcal{C}(M^{\{\infty\}})$: given $x, y \in M^{\{\geq \infty\}}$ s.t. $x < y$, either $x = z^-$ and $y = z^+$ for some z , or there exists z s.t. $[x] < [z] < [y]$, therefore, given such a z , the inequality $x < (z, t) < y$ holds for an arbitrary choice of $t \in \ker(\rho)$. $\square$

5.13 Corollary. *Let M be a dom: if $W(M)$ has finite cardinality then M is isomorphic to a sub-dom of some proper dom N .*

The Corollary is a trivial consequence of

Claim 3. Let M be a dom: if $M^{\{\geq k\}}$ is proper for some $k \in W(M)$, and, for that k , $\{x \in W(M) \mid x < k\}$ has finite cardinality, then M is isomorphic to a sub-dom of some proper dom N .

Proof of Claim 3. Suppose, for contradiction, that there exists a dom M and $k \in W(M)$ that satisfy the hypothesis of the claim, but not the conclusion. We can assume that $n = \#\{x \in W(M) \mid x < k\}$ is minimal. Let $\{k_0, \dots, k_{n-1}\} = \{x \in W(M) \mid x < k\}$ with $0 = k_0 < \dots < k_{n-1}$. By Lemma 5.12, $M^{\{\geq k_{n-1}\}}$ is a sub-dom of some proper dom K , and, by §4.5, $H = M^{\{< k_{n-1}\}} \sqcup K$ is a dom extending M . Moreover $H^{\{\geq k_{n-1}\}} = K$ is proper by construction, but $\{x \in W(H) \mid x < k_{n-1}\} = \{k_0, \dots, k_{n-2}\}$ has cardinality $n - 1$, contradicting the minimality of n . $\square$

5.14 Corollary. *Let M be a dom, such that $W(M)$ has finite cardinality. Then, there exists an ordered group G s.t.:*

1. *if M is of the first type, then M is a sub-dom of $\tilde{G}$;*
2. *if M is of the second or the third type, then M is a sub-dom of $\check{G}$.*

Proof. Obvious because M is a sub-dom of some proper dom N , and N can be embedded in an appropriate $\check{G}$ or $\tilde{G}$ either by Theorem 1 or Lemma 5.7. $\square$

- 2 Theorem.**
1. *The (first-order) theory of doms of first type (axioms of doms, plus $\mathbf{0} = \delta$) is the universal part of the theory of the structures $\tilde{G}$, as G varies among ordered (Abelian) groups. Moreover, every dom of the first type is a sub-dom of $\tilde{G}$, for some ordered group G .*
 2. *The theory of doms of second type (pre-doms plus **MA** with the strict inequality, **MB** and **MC**, and $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{0} > \mathbf{0}$) is the universal part of the theory of cuts of discretely ordered groups. Moreover, every dom of the second type is a sub-dom of $\check{G}$, for some discretely ordered group G .*
 3. *The theory of doms of third type (pre-doms plus **MA** with the strict inequality, **MB** and **MC**, and $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$) is the universal part of the theory of cuts of densely ordered groups. Moreover, every dom of the second type is a sub-dom of $\check{G}$, for some densely ordered group G .*

Proof. We will give a proof of the statement for doms of the third type: the other cases are similar.

Let T be the theory of proper doms of the third type, S be the theory of doms of the third type, and $\mathcal{C}$ the class of cuts of densely ordered Abelian groups. By Corollary 5.13 every finitely generated model of S can be embedded in a model of T , and by Lemma 5.7, every model of T can be embedded in a structure in $\mathcal{C}$. Proposition 5.11 implies the conclusion. $\square$

5.5 Embedding a dom in a collapse

We now give a different kind of embedding for doms of the third type.

Let M be a dom of the third type, $G := G(M)$, and $H := H(M)$. If G is densely ordered, define $K := G$. Otherwise, let 1 be the minimal positive element of G , and $K := G + 1 \cdot \mathbb{Q}$, the subgroup of $G \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ (the divisible hull of G) generated by G and $1/n$, as n varies in $\mathbb{N}^*$. Since K has no minimal positive element, K is densely ordered. Consider the dom $\check{K}$ of the Dedekind cuts of K ; since K is densely ordered, $\check{K}$ is a dom of the third type. We have seen that the group K embeds into $G(K)$, via the map sending γ to $[\gamma^+]$, hence H also embeds into $G(K)$. Note also that the whole K is contained in $H(\check{K})$, hence in particular H is contained in $H(\check{K})$; call $\check{\iota}$ such embedding. Therefore, we can define the dom $\text{Coll}(\check{K}, H)$.

3 Theorem. *If M is a strongly proper dom of the third type, then, with the above definitions of H , K and $\check{\iota}$, and $N := \text{Coll}(\check{K}, H)$, there exists a unique dom-homomorphism $\check{\psi} : M \rightarrow N$ such that the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\check{\psi}} & N \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ M/\equiv & \xrightarrow{\check{\iota}} & \check{K}/\equiv \end{array}$$

Moreover, $\check{\psi}$ is injective.

We recall that N is $\check{K}/\equiv \times_H 2$.

Proof. It is easy to see that M and K satisfy the condition (*) of Remark 3.53. Hence, the map $\Lambda_K : M^{\{>0\}} \rightarrow \check{K}$ sending w to $\{\lambda \in K : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} : \lambda \leq [y] \text{ \& } y < w\}^+$ is an injective quasi-dom-homomorphism. Moreover, the only possible value for $\check{\psi}(w)$ for $w \in M^{\{>0\}}$ is $\Lambda_K(w)$.

It remains to define $\check{\psi}(z)$ for $z \in M^{\{0\}}$.

Since z is in $M^{\{0\}}$, then $[z] \in K$, hence $[z]^+$ and $[z]^-$ are elements of $\check{K}$. Let $B := \pi^{-1}(H) \subseteq M^{\{0\}}$, $C := M^{\{0\}} \setminus B$, $B' := \pi^{-1}(H) \subseteq \check{K}^{\{0\}}$, $C' := \check{K}^{\{0\}} \setminus C$.

If $z = x \in C$, then $[x]^+$ and $[x]^-$ are identified in N to the same element, which we will also call $[x]$, and we must define $\check{\psi}(x) := [x] \in C'$.

If $z = y \in B$, then y has multiplicity 2, namely $[y] = \{F^-(y), F^+(y)\}$. Moreover, $[y]^-$ and $[y]^+$ are distinct elements of B' . If we want to preserve the signature, we must define $\check{\psi}(F^-(y)) := [y]^-$, and $\check{\psi}(F^+(y)) := [y]^+$.

It remains to prove that $\check{\psi}$ is indeed a dom-homomorphism.

Let us prove that $\tilde{\psi}(z+z') = \tilde{\psi}(z) + \tilde{\psi}(z')$. Since the diagram commutes, $\pi(\tilde{\psi}(z+z')) = \pi(\tilde{\psi}(z) + \tilde{\psi}(z'))$, hence the only case when we might not have equality is when $\tilde{\psi}(z+z') \in B'$, i.e. when $z+z' \in B$. Note also that, by definition, $\tilde{\psi}$ preserves the signature of every element of $M^{\{0\}}$, and that $\text{sign}(y) \neq 0$ for every $y \in B$. It is enough to prove that $\tilde{\psi}(z) + \tilde{\psi}(z')$ and $z+z'$ have the same signature. There are two possible cases: $z = x$ and $z' = x'$ are both in C , or $z = y$ and $z' = y'$ are both in B . In the first case, $\text{sign}(x) = \text{sign}(x') = 0$, hence, by Proposition 3.43, $\text{sign}(x+x') = -1$. The same is true for $\tilde{\psi}(x)$ and $\tilde{\psi}(x')$, and we have the conclusion. In the second case, by Proposition 3.43, the signature of $y+y'$ depends only on the sign of y and of y' , and the same is true for $\tilde{\psi}(y)$ and $\tilde{\psi}(y')$, and we can conclude. The fact that $\tilde{\psi}$ is injective is now trivial. $\square$

Note that in the above proof we could not use, instead of K , an arbitrary densely ordered group containing G . More precisely, every $w \in M^{\{>0\}}$ determines the following partition of K :

$$\Lambda'(w) := (\{ \lambda \in K : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} : \lambda \leq [y] \text{ \& } y < w \}, \\ \{ \lambda \in K : \exists y \in M^{\{0\}} : \lambda \geq [y] \text{ \& } y > w \}).$$

The problem lies in the fact that $\Lambda'(w)$ is *not* a cut in general (cf. Lemma 3.51).

For instance, let $G := \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$, $M := \tilde{G}$, $K := \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{R}$, $a := \{ (0, q) : q \in \mathbb{R} \}^+ = \{ (1, q) : q \in \mathbb{R} \}^- \in M$. Note that G is already dense, and that $G(M) = G$. Then,

$$\Lambda'(a)^L = \{ (0, q) : q \in \mathbb{R} \}^+, \\ \Lambda'(a)^R = \{ (1, q) : q \in \mathbb{R} \}^-.$$

Hence, $\Lambda'(a)^L < (1/2, y) < \Lambda'(a)^R$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

6 Axiomatisation of doms

6.1 Lemma. *The axioms **MA**, **MB**, **MC(a)** and **MC(b)** are independent. That is, if we choose any one of them, we can find a pre-dom satisfying the other ones, but not the chosen axiom.*

Example 3.13 shows that axioms **MA** (if we choose $\delta > 0$) and **MB** (choosing $\delta < 0$ and different from -1) are independent.

For Axiom **MC**, the examples are given below, via the addition tables of some finite pre-doms.

The pre-dom with n element will be given as the set of the first n natural element $\{0, 2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$, ordered in the usual way. Note that if we want our structure to be a pre-dom, the only possible definition of $-i$ is $-i := n \ast i$ for every $i < n$ (where we denoted with $\ast$ the minus on the integers). Axiom **PA** is equivalent to the fact that the sum increases as we go from the left to the right on the same row. The commutativity of the sum is equivalent to the fact that the table is symmetric around the principal diagonal.

Moreover, axioms **MA** and **MB** will be satisfied iff the neutral element is $\mathbf{0} := \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, namely $n/2$ if n is even, $(n+1)/2$ if n is odd, and hence $\delta = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Axiom **MC(b)** is equivalent to $-x + x \leq \delta$, namely every element in the addition table in the anti-diagonal is less or equal to δ . Axiom **MC(a)** is equivalent to $x > -y \rightarrow y + x > \delta$, namely every element below the anti-diagonal is $> \delta$.

Examples. 6.2. A pre-dom with 3 elements satisfying axioms **MA**, **MB** and **MC(a)**, but not **MC(b)** (the neutral element is in bold):

+	0	1	2
0	0	0	2
1	0	1	2
2	2	2	2

6.3. Two pre-doms with 4 elements satisfying axioms **MA**, **MB** and **MC(b)**, but not **MC(a)**:

+	0	1	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	1	1
2	0	1	2	3
3	0	1	3	3

+	0	1	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1
2	0	1	2	3
3	0	1	3	3

6.4. For confrontation, here are the addition tables of the (trivial) doms with 3, 4 and 5 elements respectively:

+	0	1	2
0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2
2	0	2	2

+	0	1	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	1	3
2	0	1	2	3
3	0	3	3	3

+	0	1	2	3	4
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	1	1	4
2	0	1	2	3	4
3	0	1	3	3	4
4	0	4	4	4	4

The above tables were obtained using the Alloy program.²³ Thanks to Ivan Lanese for explaining to me how to use Alloy. Note that the difficult part in such tables is checking whether the addition is associative: for instance, the following one is not.

+	0	1	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	3
2	0	1	2	3
3	0	3	3	3

Finally, note that by Proposition 3.15(5), $x - y$ can be defined in terms of the plus and order alone. In particular, $-y = \delta - y = \max\{z \in M : y + z \leq \delta\}$. Hence, the minus can be defined in terms of the plus, the order and δ .

Therefore, if $(M, \leq, \mathbf{0}, +)$ is an Abelian ordered monoid, and $\delta \in M$, then there is at most one minus on M such that $(M, \leq, \mathbf{0}, +, -)$ is a dom. The necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of such minus are the following:

- $\delta \leq \mathbf{0}$;
- the interval $(\delta, \mathbf{0})$ is empty;
- for every $y \in M$, $-y := \max\{z \in M : y + z \leq \delta\}$ exists;

²³<http://alloy.mit.edu/>

- $-(-y) = y$.

Call **MC'** the following axiom (which is equivalent to Proposition 3.15(11)):

$$\mathbf{MC}'. \quad (x + y) - z \geq x + (y - z).$$

6.5 Lemma. *Let M be a pre-dom, satisfying axioms **MA**, **MB** and **MC'**. Then, M is a dom.*

Proof. *Claim 1.* $x +^R \mathbf{0} \geq x$.

In fact, $x +^R \mathbf{0} = -((-x) + \delta)$. Since $\delta \leq \mathbf{0}$, the latter is greater or equal to $-((-x) + \mathbf{0}) = x$.

Claim 2. $x +^R z \geq x + z$.

In fact,

$$x + z \leq (x +^R \mathbf{0}) + z \leq x +^R (\mathbf{0} + z) = x +^R z,$$

where the second inequality is obtained from Axiom **MC'**, using $y = \mathbf{0}$.

We remind that, by Remark 4.7, in a pre-dom Axiom **MC(b)** is equivalent to the following claim.

Claim 3. $\hat{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$.

In fact, $-\hat{x} = x \stackrel{L}{\leq} x \leq x - x = \hat{x}$. The conclusion follows from Axiom **MB**.

Therefore, it remains to prove the following claim.

Claim 4. If $x < y$, then $x - y < \mathbf{0}$.

In fact, $x < y \leq y + \hat{x}$. By substituting $x := y$, $y := -x$, and $z := x$ in Axiom **MC'**, we obtain that the latter is less or equal to $(y \stackrel{L}{\leq} x) +^R x$. Hence,

$$x +^R \delta = x < x +^R (y \stackrel{L}{\leq} x).$$

Therefore, $y \stackrel{L}{\leq} x > \delta$, which is equivalent to the conclusion. $\square$

Note that the pre-dom M in Example 3.13 satisfies Axiom **MC'** for every choice of $\delta \in G$ (even in the stronger form $(x + y) - z = x + (y - z)$). Moreover, for suitable choice of δ , M will satisfy **MA** and not **MB**, or **MB** and not **MA**. Hence, the axioms **MA**, **MB**, and **MC'** are independent.

7 Valuations

7.1 Definition (Valued doms). A **valued dom** is a triple (M, v, C) , where M is a dom, C an ordered set with a minimum $-\infty$, and $v : M \rightarrow C$ (the **valuation**) is a surjective map satisfying the following conditions: for every $x, y \in M$,

$$\mathbf{V1.} \quad v(\mathbf{0}) = -\infty;$$

$$\mathbf{V2.} \quad v(-x) = v(x);$$

$$\mathbf{V3.} \quad v(x + y) \leq \max\{v(x), v(y)\}.$$

For every $c \in C$, define

$$\mathcal{O}(c) := \{x \in M : v(x) \leq c\}.$$

The valuation v is **convex** if it satisfies the following condition:

V4. $|x| \leq |y|$ implies $v(x) \leq v(y)$.

The valuation v is **strong** if in the Axiom **V3** equality holds.

For the rest of this section, (M, v, C) is a valued dom.

7.2 Remark. For every $x, y \in M$,

$$v(x \overset{R}{+} y) \leq \max\{v(x), v(y)\},$$

and the same for $v(x - y)$ and $v(x \overset{L}{-} y)$. Moreover, for every $c \in C$, $\mathcal{O}(c)$ is a sub-dom of M .

Proof. $v(x \overset{R}{+} y) = v(-((-x) + (-y))) = v((-x) + (-y)) \leq \max\{v(-x), v(-y)\} = \max\{v(x), v(y)\}.$

The fact that $\mathcal{O}(c)$ is a sub-dom is now trivial. $\square$

Note that the family $(\mathcal{O}(c))_{c \in C}$ is an increasing family of sub-doms of M .

7.3 Definition. Given another valuation $v' : M \rightarrow C'$ on M , we say that (M, v', C') is a **coarsening** of v , or that v is a **refinement** of v' , iff there exists an order-preserving map $\chi : C \rightarrow C'$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{v} & C \\ & \searrow v' & \downarrow \chi \\ & & C' \end{array}$$

7.4 Remark. The function χ in the above definition, if it exists, is unique and surjective. Moreover, the existence of χ is equivalent to:

(*) for every $x, y \in M$, if $v(x) \leq v(y)$, then $v'(x) \leq v'(y)$.

Proof. The only possible definition of χ is $\chi(v(x)) = v'(x)$. It is evident that the above defined map χ is well-defined and order-preserving iff (*) is true. Finally, χ is surjective, because v and v' are. $\square$

Examples. 7.5. The map sending every element of M to $-\infty$ is a valuation, the **trivial** valuation.

7.6. If M is not of the second type, the map $v : M \rightarrow \{-\infty, 1\}$ sending ± 0 to $-\infty$, and everything else to 1 is a valuation.

7.7. On an ordered group G , a valuation in the group-theoretic sense is also a valuation in our sense. On the other hand, a dom-valuation v is a group-valuation iff 0 is the only element such that $v(x) = -\infty$.

7.8. The triple $(M, \overset{\wedge}{\cdot}, W)^{24}$ is a strong valuation on M , called the **width** valuation.

²⁴Where $\overset{\wedge}{\cdot}(x) = x - x$

7.9. For every $x, y \in M$, define $x \preccurlyeq y$ if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|x| \leq \underbrace{|y| +^R \dots +^R |y|}_{n \text{ times}}.$$

Define $x \sim_{\mathbb{N}} y$ if $x \preccurlyeq y$ and $y \preccurlyeq x$. It is obvious that $\preccurlyeq$ is a total pre-order, hence $\sim_{\mathbb{N}}$ is an equivalence relation on M , and $\preccurlyeq$ induces an ordering on $M/\sim_{\mathbb{N}}$. Moreover, the equivalence class of $\mathbf{0}$ is the minimum of $M/\sim_{\mathbb{N}}$. Finally, if we call $v_{\mathbb{N}}$ the quotient map from M to $M/\sim_{\mathbb{N}}$, then $(M, v_{\mathbb{N}}, M/\sim_{\mathbb{N}})$ is a valued dom. The map $v_{\mathbb{N}}$ is the **natural valuation** on M .

Note that the concept of strong valuation is trivial in the case when M is an ordered group (namely, the only strong valuation is the trivial one).

7.10 Lemma. *A valuation v is convex iff it is a coarsening of the natural valuation, iff for every $c \in C$ the sub-dom $\mathcal{O}(c)$ is convex.*

Proof. Immediate from Remark 7.4. $\square$

7.11 Lemma. *A valuation is strong iff it is a coarsening of the width valuation. Moreover, in that case $v(x +^R y) = \max\{v(x), v(y)\}$, and the same for $v(x - y)$ and $v(x \perp y)$.*

Proof. If v is strong, then $v(\hat{x}) = v(x)$. The conclusion now follows from Remark 7.4. $\square$

7.12 Lemma. *If (M, v, C) is either strong or convex, then, for every $x, y \in M$, $v(x +^R y) = v(x + y)$, and $v(x \perp y) = v(x - y)$. Moreover, if $v(x) < v(y)$, then $v(x + y) = v(y)$.*

Proof. The conclusion is true for the natural and the width valuations. A valuation v satisfying the hypothesis is a coarsening of the natural or the trivial valuations, by Lemmata 7.10 and 7.11. The conclusion now follows from Remark 7.4. $\square$

7.13 Definition-Lemma. For every $x \in M$, define

$$w(x) := \{\hat{y} \in W : y + \hat{x} = x \vee y - \hat{x} = x\}^-,$$

where the lower edge is taken in $\tilde{W}$. Then, w is a valuation on M .

Note that, by definition, $w(x) \leq \hat{x}$, that $w(\hat{x}) = \mathbf{0}^-$, and that $w(x) = \mathbf{0}^-$ iff there exists $y \in M^{\{0\}}$ such that $x = y \pm \hat{x}$.

Proof. Let us prove that $w(-x) = w(x)$. Let $y \in M$ such that $y \pm \hat{x} = x$. Hence, $(-y) \mp \hat{x} = -x$, thus $w(-x) \leq w(x)$, and we are done.

Let $x, x' \in M$ such that $\hat{x}' \leq \hat{x}$. Let us prove that $w(x + x') \leq w(x)$. Choose y and $y' \in M$ such that $y \pm \hat{x} = x$, $y' \pm \hat{x}' = x'$, and $\hat{y} \leq \hat{x}$, and $\hat{y}' \leq \hat{x}'$.

Claim 1. There exists $z \in M$ such that $\hat{z} \leq \widehat{y + y'}$, and $x + x' = z \pm \hat{x}$.

If $\hat{y} = \hat{x}$, or $\hat{y}' = \hat{x}$, then choose $z = x + x'$, and we are done. Otherwise, let $z = y + y'$: in this case, $\hat{z} < \hat{x}$. Then, $x + x' \leq z + \hat{x}$. Moreover, $z - \hat{x} = y + y' \perp \hat{x} = (y - \hat{x}) + (y' - \hat{x}) \leq x + x'$. Let $t := x + x'$: note that $\hat{t} = \hat{x}$. Suppose, for contradiction, that, $z - \hat{t} < t < z + \hat{t}$. Thus, $(z + \hat{t}) \perp (z - \hat{t}) > t - t$, hence $\hat{t} \perp \hat{z} > \hat{t}$, absurd.

The conclusion now follows from the claim, since for every width o such that $o > \max\{w(x), w(x')\}$, there exist $\hat{y}$ and $\hat{y}'$ such that $o \geq \hat{y} > w(x)$ and $o \geq \hat{y}' > w(x')$. By the claim, we have that $\widehat{y + y'} > w(x + x')$, therefore $o > w(x + x')$, and we are done. $\square$

7.14 Example. Let G be an ordered group. It might happen that there exists $\Lambda \in \check{G}$ such that $w(\Lambda) > \mathbf{0}^-$. For instance, let G be the group $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{R}$, with the lexicographic ordering. Let $\Lambda := \{(q, t) : \sqrt{2} > q \in \mathbb{Q}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}^+$. Then, $w(\Lambda) > \mathbf{0}^-$.

8 Conclusion

We have shown the fact that the theory of doms (plus the axiom $-\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{0}$) is the universal part of the theory of Dedekind cuts of ordered (Abelian) groups. This means that if a universal sentence for cuts is true, then it can be proven using the axioms for doms alone and $\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, a dom is nothing else than a substructure of $\check{G}$ or $\tilde{G}$ for some ordered group G , and the axioms of doms characterise the class of such substructures. Some natural questions we left open are the following:

- Is there a “nice” (e.g. recursive) axiomatisation for the (first-order) theory of cuts of ordered groups?
- What is the model-completion of the theory of doms (if it exists)?

Using results of Baur [1], it is not difficult to see that the theory of doms is undecidable. Some related questions are:

- Does it exist an algorithm to decide which *universal* formulae follows from the theory of doms?
- Is the theory of cuts of ordered groups decidable?

Bibliographical notes. Dedekind cuts of an ordered Abelian group G have been extensively studied, especially for the purpose of building the Dedekind completion of G [3, 2, 4]. A more detailed study of the arithmetic properties of the set of Dedekind cuts of G has also been undertaken by several authors, especially for the case when G is the additive group of an ordered field [6, 14, 11, 13, 8]. The concepts of width of an element and signature were already introduced by Gonshor [6]. For the reader’s convenience, we include a “translation” between Gonshor’s notation [6] and ours:

- $\text{ab}(x)$, the absorption number of x , is $\hat{x}$, the width of x ;
- x is a positive idempotent iff x is a width of M ;
- if $0 < k \in W(M)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} xRy \mod k & \text{ iff } x + k = y + k; \\ xSy \mod k & \text{ iff } [x + k]_k = [y + k]_k; \\ xTy \mod k & \text{ iff } |x - y| < k; \end{aligned}$$
- x has type 1 iff $\text{sign}(x) = 1$, while x has type 1A iff $\text{sign}(x) = -1$.

References

- [1] W. Baur. Undecidability of the theory of abelian groups with a subgroup. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 55(1):125–128, 1976.

- [2] G. Birkhoff. *Lattice theory*. Third edition. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXV. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1967.
- [3] L. W. Cohen and C. Goffman. The topology of ordered Abelian groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 67:310–319, 1949.
- [4] L. Fuchs. *Partially ordered algebraic systems*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1963.
- [5] L. Fuchs. *Infinite abelian groups. Vol. I & II*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 36 & 36-II. Academic Press, New York, 1970 & 1973.
- [6] H. Gonshor. Remarks on the Dedekind completion of a nonstandard model of the reals. *Pacific J. Math.*, 118(1):117–132, 1985.
- [7] T. Gldenbergl. Elementare invarianten von dedekindschnitten angeordneter krper. Master’s thesis, Universitt Regensburg, 2004.
- [8] F.-V. Kuhlmann. Invariance group and invariance valuation ring of a cut. Unpublished, 6 2004.
- [9] S. Mac Lane. *Homology*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, first edition, 1967. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 114.
- [10] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [11] G. G. Pestov. On the theory of cuts in ordered fields. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 42(6):1350–1360, iii, 2001. [English translation: *Siberian Math. J.* 42 (2001), no. 6, 1123–1131].
- [12] D. Scott. On completing ordered fields. In *Applications of Model Theory to Algebra, Analysis, and Probability (Internat. Sympos., Pasadena, Calif., 1967)*, pages 274–278. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969.
- [13] M. Tressl. Model completeness of o-minimal structures expanded by Dedekind cuts. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 70(1):29–60, 2005.
- [14] F. Wehrung. Monoids of intervals of ordered abelian groups. *J. Algebra*, 182(1):287–328, 1996.